

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 767

95

SP 010 482

AUTHOR Wallace, Joan D., Ed.
TITLE Report on the National Conference on Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education. June 4, 5, 6, 1976. Sugar Loaf Conference Center. Philadelphia, Pa.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 76
CONTRACT 400-76-0043
NOTE 88p.
AVAILABLE FROM Research for Better Schools, Inc., Suite 1700, 1700 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Development; Conference Reports; Democratic Values; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Planning; *Educational Research; *Ethical Values; Humanistic Education; Moral Development; *Moral Values; Objectives; *Public Policy; Social Science Research; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Planning for Moral Citizenship Education; *Values Education

ABSTRACT

The National Conference on Moral/Citizenship Education (MCE) was the major activity of Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education, a year-long national planning effort. The primary purpose of the conference was to develop MCE recommendations from as wide a base as possible concerning research, development, and dissemination, with the ultimate goal of submitting the recommendations to NIE and the public for programs that will have an impact on our schools and our society consistent with democratic values and principles. The report outlines the background of the conference including the objectives, public concerns, assumptions, activities, and products of its planning effort. The conference recommendations focus on public policy, theory, research, development, and dissemination. Each category details the highlights from several inputs: the major conference presentations, the work-group reports, the discussion by reactant panels, discussion from the floor, a brainstorming session, responses to individual questionnaires, and comments on the first draft of the proceedings report. (JMF)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED129767

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PLANNING FOR MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

June 4, 5, 6, 1976
Sugar Loaf Conference Center
Philadelphia, PA

PLANNING FOR MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

RUSSELL A. HILL, Director
JOAN D. WALLACE, Editor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NOVEMBER 1976



RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
SUITE 1700/1700 MARKET STREET/PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

SP 010 482

Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education is funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE). Published by RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC., a private non-profit corporation. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0043 with the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
PLANNING FOR MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

JUNE 4, 5, 6, 1976
SUGAR LOAF CONFERENCE CENTER
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

PLANNING FOR
MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

RUSSELL A. HILL, Director
JOAN D. WALLACE, Editor

NOVEMBER 1976

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
SUITE 1700/1700 MARKET STREET/PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103

Acknowledgments

Our thanks to Louis M. Maguire, Director of Research and Development Division, Research for Better Schools, for his leadership, support, and comments in the preparation of this Conference report. Research for Better Schools provided generous financial support for the Conference. We also wish to thank Wende Woehr and Patty Dively for their assistance in preparing the report. Finally, and most important, we are indebted to those who gave so generously of their time and talent -- the Conference participants.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	i
Overview.	iii
Conference Background	1
Objectives of Planning Effort.	1
Public Concerns.	1
Assumptions of Planning Effort	2
Activities of Planning Effort.	3
Products of Planning Effort.	3
Description of Conference	7
Objectives of Conference	7
Assumptions of Conference.	7
Process of Conference.	8
Conference Constituency.	8
Flow of Conference Events.	9
Conference Recommendations.	19
Introduction	19
Recommendations.	20
Public Policy	20
Highlights	25
Theory.	26
Highlights	30
Research.	31
Highlights	37
Development	38
Highlights	45
Dissemination	46
Highlights	51

Implementation Issues: Brainstorming Session (Selected Comments)	52
Sense of the Conference	55
Evaluation of the Conference.	57
Conference Publication.	59
List of Conference Participants	61
Appendix: Informal Commentary on the Conference.	75

Preface

This document reports on the National Conference on Moral/Citizenship Education held in Philadelphia June 4 - 6, 1976. The Conference was a major activity of Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education, a year-long national planning effort carried out by Research for Better Schools (RBS) pursuant to Contract 400-76-00'3 with the National Institute of Education (NIE). The intent of this report is to provide both an overview and a detailed analysis of the objectives, assumptions, content, process, products, and evaluation of the Conference. Detailed documentation concerning these aspects of the Conference is available from RBS.

Overview

The National Conference on Moral/Citizenship Education was convened by RBS at the Sugar Loaf Conference Center, Philadelphia, Pa., June 4 - 6, 1976. The Conference was the focal activity of the national planning effort on moral/citizenship education (MCE) carried out by RBS under contract with NIE. It was supported in large part by RBS corporate funds.

The Conference brought together both MCE experts and a multidisciplinary group representing a variety of viewpoints and interests. Because of limited lodging facilities, participation was restricted to 85 individuals. The planning effort's Advisory Group and Resource Panel played an important role in shaping the Conference. These two groups represent major educational, religious, civic, and scholarly interests.

The primary purpose of the Conference (in addition to facilitating an exchange of information across the MCE field) was to develop MCE recommendations from as wide a base as possible concerning research, development, and dissemination (R, D, and D), with the ultimate goal of submitting the recommendations to NIE and the public. The format, process, and conceptualization of the Conference were designed around this purpose. The key process was one of interaction, with work groups arriving at recommendations on the basis of informational papers presented at the Conference and work-group deliberations.

This report focuses on a description and analysis of these and related Conference elements.

Conference Background

Objectives of Planning Effort

The initial objective of the MCE planning effort, of which the Conference was the most important activity, was to develop MCE recommendations for R, D, and D; its ultimate objective was to develop MCE programs which will have an impact on our schools and our society consistent with democratic values and principles.

Public Concerns

The planning effort was initiated in response to a widely expressed need for coordination and leadership in MCE. This concern centers around the following considerations.

MCE is a tradition in the United States. Schools have always been expected to perpetuate the socialization of their students. The curriculum is expected to reinforce values initiated in the home and to inculcate the principles of worthy citizenship, either directly or indirectly. And when the home or religious institutions (once partners with schools in providing moral education) fail to introduce the child to these principles, the schools are expected to assume the primary responsibility.

The current social malaise -- reflected in the rising incidence of crime, a growing social alienation among many of the young, the widespread breakdown of the family, and a dwindling faith in the democratic process -- offers ample reason for the increasingly vocal call for education that instills a firm foundation in moral/ethical values. A growing body of research and increased practitioner involvement further demonstrate the increasing prominence of MCE.

To cite two representative studies, first, an analysis was recently made of public documents of national groups (State Departments of Education, parent groups, school boards, religious groups, legal groups, and other organizations related to the public good) which bear on the importance and desired characteristics of MCE. Second, a survey of parent and

teacher opinion was conducted in four regions of the country regarding a number of substantive aspects of MCE (see "Products of Planning Effort" section). In both studies the findings were clear: MCE is generally perceived as an obligation of the school curriculum, an educational imperative.

Despite the unquestionable importance of sound MCE, confusion surrounds the question of how best to carry it out. Conflicting theories of learning and practice are espoused, little is known about the most appropriate ways to integrate MCE into the traditional curriculum, and there is evident dispute -- with respect to research findings, content, and method.

In view of these circumstances, it would seem essential to take thorough stock of the situation. What values, for example, do parents want taught? Are the policies of various professional organizations congruent or incongruent? Is the existing research literature definitive, or do serious voids exist? Are some teaching methodologies more effective than others, and if so, under what conditions?

Assumptions of Planning Effort

Based, in part, on these considerations and on an examination of current activity (both research and practice), the MCE planning effort was predicated on the following assumptions:

- The public has clearly expressed the desire that the educational community and other interest groups join together to develop and implement effective MCE in the schools.
- This desire can and must be acted on in ways that do not violate the rights, beliefs, and values of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities within our pluralistic society.
- MCE must be based on the recommendations of a wide variety of experts in different fields of specialization. The planning program thus must stem from a collaborative process -- from a truly joint effort to determine ends and means.

- The knowledge-base for MCE provides a promising foundation for analyzing key issues, evaluating alternative instructional techniques, and weighing substantive priorities. The more prominent approaches include the cognitive-decision theorists (Coombs, Peters, Wilson); the developmental theorists (Bull, Havinghurst, Kohlberg, Loevinger, Piaget); the prosocial behavior theorists (Aronfreed, Bandura, Hoffman, Staub); and the values theorists (Lasswell, Louis Rath, Rokeach).
- A planning program must be based on careful and systematic coordination. The diversity of approaches cited above has led to a mix of information. The planning task is to consider ways to draw together and expand the body of knowledge, document essential further research, and — in time — develop effective educational programs that are acceptable to the public-at-large, respect our pluralistic beliefs, and provide the young with ethical guidelines by which to live.

Activities of Planning Effort

The sequence of the planning-effort activities included:

- Collection of Data from Interviews
- Collection and Analysis of Literature Across the Field
- Establishment of a Communication Network
- Formation of an Advisory Group and Resource Panel
- Convocation of a National Conference (the subject of this report)
- Preparation of Planning Recommendations
- Development of Publications

From a procedural viewpoint, the program embraced the following steps: search and analyze information, conceptualize, seek input, draft recommendations, seek criticisms, and submit recommendations.

Products of Planning Effort

As a vehicle for both information and communication, planning-effort products have taken, or are planned to take, several forms.

- A bibliography of approximately 1,800 documents dealing with moral/values education, coded by type of document and content. The bibliography was completed during the spring of 1976 and disseminated in the fall to numerous requestors.
- A collection of selected readings which present the most salient statements of acknowledged leaders in four major approaches to MCE: cognitive decision, developmental, prosocial, and values. This collection was completed in the spring of 1976, was mailed to all Conference participants prior to the Conference, and has been disseminated, on request, to a variety of groups and individuals.
- A Conference report, including major inputs, proceedings, and recommendations (this document).
- A MCE book (see "Conference Publication" section).
- Survey and questionnaire findings concerning the need for and implementation of MCE. Two of these, (The Importance and Desired Characteristics of Moral/Ethical Education in the Public Schools: A Systematic Analysis of Recent Documents and Teacher and Parent Opinion Concerning Moral/Ethical Education in the Public Schools: A Report of an Institute for Survey Research Study), completed as part of another RBS work unit, have been disseminated on request. Although not in the planning-effort contract, a third paper, reporting on and analyzing current state MCE goals, activities, and projected activities, is in preparation.
- An overview of the MCE planning effort has been completed. Efforts are being made to prepare additional papers dealing with special aspects of MCE, e.g., historical perspective, contemporary issues. These are planned to be completed by December 1976.
- An annotated bibliography of several hundred experimental studies reporting effects in the moral/values education domain. This document is completed, with the exception of editorial summaries, analyses, and overviews. Publication is scheduled for December 1976.

- Occasional Papers. Although not in the planning-effort contract, an attempt has been made to facilitate communication among those interested in MCE. Significant papers have been prepared and/or disseminated. The first such paper is a speech entitled Morality and Citizenship Education: Whose Responsibility? presented by Terrel H. Bell, Commissioner of Higher Education for the State of Utah, at the National Conference for Education and Citizenship. This conference, sponsored by the United States Office of Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers, was held in Kansas City, Mo., in September 1976. Dr. Bell's speech represents an important policy proposal from a national leader in public education. The second paper, prepared by Edwin Fenton, Carnegie-Mellon University, is entitled The Relationship of Citizenship Education to Values Education. It contains important recommendations from a national MCE leader. RBS corporate funds finance this publication. These two papers will be disseminated by December 1976.

Description of Conference

Objectives of Conference

The primary objective of the Conference was to develop recommendations for the development of a plan for R, D, and D in MCE. Subobjectives related to heightening the visibility of the field, bringing together and fostering communication among diverse professional individuals and groups, and promoting acceptance of, and support for, MCE among leaders in the educational community.

Assumptions of Conference

Several assumptions underlay the intent and design of the Conference.

- A Conference on the broad issues of MCE would benefit from a conceptual framework for the dialogues. Thus the Conference planners identified four significant approaches to MCE (cognitive decision, developmental, prosocial, and values) and used these as a frame of reference for Conference input and discussion. (See "Flow of Conference Events" section for more detailed description of these approaches.)
- The Conference would benefit from a structure for presenting this conceptual information and a process for participants to use in preparing recommendations.
- The Conference would benefit from a wide constituency representing the educational establishment, varied disciplines, scholars and practitioners, and private and public funding enablers.
- The Conference would benefit from addressing R, D, and D issues from the point of view of five perspectives traditional in educational development: public policy, theory, research, development, and dissemination.
- The end product of the Conference should be R, D, and D recommendations for a MCE plan.

Process of Conference

In order to achieve its primary objective of the preparation of R, D, and D recommendations, the Conference process was based on four key activities. First, four background papers were presented by leading spokesmen for an outstanding approach to MCE. These papers, products in themselves, provided a conceptual framework as well as the authors' recommendations, and stimulated and guided later Conference discussion. Second, a process-product format was established. Participants selected brainstorming work groups, arranged by topic, in which they were called upon to produce MCE recommendations within the purview of their particular topic, and to report these recommendations to the entire Conference periodically. The work groups were guided by trained leaders who were also responsible for presenting the report of recommendations. Each reporting session was followed by comments of a reactant panel and discussion from the floor. Third, careful selection of participants assured that the final recommendations reflected the support of the diverse viewpoints, interests, and expertise represented by the Conference constituency. Last, individual questionnaires were filled out by participants, who listed their concerns, priorities, and judgment concerning MCE recommendations. Taken together, this four-phase process provided an open climate conducive to a fertile exchange of ideas and an enthusiasm for and commitment to the task at hand -- the preparation of R, D, and D recommendations.

Conference Constituency

Since Conference attendance was limited, especial care was taken that those selected to participate represented a broad range of perspectives. They were drawn from three main categories.

- MCE experts -- acknowledged leaders in policy, research, theory, development, and practice; those experienced and influential in the field, although representing diverse backgrounds. Their role was to share information, insights, and ideas.

- Organizational representatives -- the gate-keepers and leaders in important educational, civic, and religious groups. Their role was to voice the concerns and viewpoints of their respective organizations.
- Representatives of foundations and government agencies -- the present or potential enablers and funders of MCE efforts. Their role was to learn of and react to MCE proposals requiring financial support.

In general, the participants were charged with the responsibility to communicate, become informed, offer input, and consider supporting the MCE effort.

(A list of Conference participants appears at the end of this report.)

Flow of Conference Events

(This section of the report focuses on the Conference process for developing recommendations. The content of recommendations and reactions are reported in the following section.)

Prior to the Conference, the staff prepared and sent to all participants a collection of selected readings delineating the four major theoretical approaches providing the Conference's conceptual framework: cognitive decision, developmental, prosocial, and values. The readings were intended as orientation and background information.

In addition, participants were notified in advance that they would be asked to choose a work group at registration and were sent a list of questions to guide and focus their thought before arrival. The questions included:

TOPICS FOR SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES ("WHAT") WORK GROUP

- What should be our definition of "moral/citizenship"? What does it include and exclude? What is it that we are attempting to foster?
- What kinds of research studies should be undertaken, and with what priority?

- What development activities, if any, should be undertaken, and with what priority?
- What theoretical problems should be addressed, and with what priority?
- What kinds of dissemination-field service activities should be undertaken, and with what priority?
- What kinds of evaluation capabilities should be developed, and with what priority?
- What kinds of nonschool programs should be researched and/or developed, and with what priority?
- What kinds of evidence indicate the need for MCE?

TOPICS FOR IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES ("HOW") WORK GROUPS

- How should MCE be presented to the educational community and the wider public?
- How can funding be obtained and coordinated?
- How should a research program be developed and administered?
- How should the levels of government -- local, state, and federal -- functionally relate to a MCE program?
- How should nongovernment groups -- foundations, civic groups, religious groups, etc. -- relate to a MCE program?
- How might MCE be integrated into the school curriculum?
- How can those interested in MCE work together to formulate policy and generate support?
- How can a planning agenda be developed which will reflect broad constituency and support?
- How should activities of differing priorities fit into the agenda? How can separate activities parallel in time be tied together?

Friday. At the time of registration, each Conference participant signed up for a work group whose topic was of particular interest to him/

her. The topics were: public policy, theory, research, development, and dissemination. Work-group members (approximately 10 per group) were asked to: (a) address MCE substantive ("what") and implementation ("how") issues from the point of view of their topic, (b) remain in the same group throughout, and (c) assume responsibility for producing R, D, and D recommendations.

Following registration, there was a social hour, during which participants became acquainted with each other and with the Conference agenda. During dinner Virginia Koehler, NIE, welcomed participants, stressed the importance of the Conference mission, and reaffirmed her agency's interest in it. Congressman Albert H. Quie (R-Minn.) then offered keynote remarks, emphasizing the national need for MCE and his personal commitment to it. The last dinner speaker was Russell A. Hill, RBS, director of the planning effort and organizer of the Conference, who presented orientation remarks. He placed the Conference within the framework of the total planning effort; outlined the purpose, underlying assumptions, and conceptual frame of reference; explained the Conference constituency as well as tasks and responsibilities; and requested the return of individual questionnaires on priorities and concerns at the end of the Conference.

After dinner, the work groups held their initial session, with the assigned task of identifying major issues, concerns, and priorities within their topic related to substantive considerations of MCE.

Thereafter, two background papers were presented, with participants having the option to attend one or the other. The first paper was presented by Norman A. Sprinthall, University of Minnesota (coauthored by Ralph L. Mosher, Boston University). Sprinthall's paper summarized the state of the art regarding the developmental theorists' approach to MCE. He presented an outline defining the general goals of schooling as including MCE as a central focus for developmental education. He examined the current psychological impact of schooling and presented a strong case suggesting that schools need to include values development as a primary objective of education. The paper then detailed specific educational objectives as derived from a cognitive-developmental framework, including

Dewey, Piaget, Kohlberg, Loevinger, Erikson, and Elkind. Multiple, yet related, perspectives were presented as a means of defining the key developmental constructs of stage, structure, and interaction. He then provided an analysis of recent developmental programs and courses currently being tried out in public schools, along with an examination of the psychological effects. He stated that many programs from different sections of the country have yielded significant results, pointing out that under conditions of significant role-taking and a balance between experiential learning and intellectual inquiry, pupils achieve positive levels of moral, values, and psychological development. Sprinthall summed up these promising directions for schooling in a series of recommendations designed to stimulate the creation of more actual in-class applications of moral, values, and psychological developmental programs.

The concurrent speaker was Ervin Staub, University of Massachusetts, who summarized the state of the art from the prosocial theorists' approach to MCE. Staub defined the prosocial domain (e.g., sharing, helping, cooperative behavior) and discussed the tendency to behave prosocially. He then examined theoretical and research issues. In examining the relationship between children and socializers, Staub considered research findings bearing on the factors of nurturance and affection, and control versus permissiveness. Reviewing relevant theory and research, Staub analyzed various teaching techniques for prosocial behavior, including: conditioning procedures, modeling, reasoning by parents and induction, and participation in prosocial behavior (e.g., assignment of responsibility and participation, role-playing as participation, indirect learning and participation in interactive experiences). Peer influence on the development of prosocial orientation was also reviewed, again with emphasis on research findings. Throughout his paper Staub proposed recommendations for more intensive application of existing knowledge.

Saturday. The first activity of the day was a 1-hour meeting of the work groups, in which discussion of substantive issues was continued.

Thereafter the two final background papers were presented, with

participants again having the option to choose which they heard. Howard Kirschenbaum, National Humanistic Education Center, presented the values approach to MCE. He suggested that many different values-education approaches share two common goals: to help individuals lead personally satisfying lives and to become constructive members of society. In this light he examined the theory and methodology of Raths and colleagues (values clarification); Rokeach; Lasswell, Rucker, and colleagues; Kohlberg (moral development); cognitive-decision-making theories; and traditional approaches like moralizing and modeling. Kirschenbaum proposed a synthesis of values-education objectives, derived from the various schools of thought. He suggested further research activities, with an emphasis on both furthering knowledge in each of the separate approaches and on undertaking some major integrative studies which address basic issues in the field. Specific development and dissemination activities were also advocated. Finally, Kirschenbaum briefly examined the general community reaction to values education.

The concurrent speaker was Jerrold Coombs, University of British Columbia, who summarized the cognitive-decision theorists' approach. He surveyed the problems and prospects of the cognitive-decision approach, stating that the goal is to teach students to make and to act on intelligent or rational decisions about moral issues. Program development involves defining and justifying what it means to be rational in making moral decisions; describing and justifying the knowledge, abilities, dispositions, etc., needed to make rational moral decisions; and developing effective and morally acceptable educational means for producing the relevant abilities. He described the features of the approach, the views of its major figures (e.g., Peters, Wilson, Hare), and significant research. Coombs then gave his views on strengths of the approach and unresolved issues, including conceptual and empirical issues. Finally, he outlined recommendations for research and development.

Following these presentations, the work groups held their last session on substantive issues, at which time they formulated recommendations. These

recommendations were reported to the total Conference immediately after lunch by the work-group leaders. Ralph Tyler, Science Research Associates, moderated at the reporting session and at the following session where members of the Resource Panel offered their reactions to the work-group recommendations.

A mid-afternoon break provided recreation for athletes and nonathletes alike, followed by a social hour and dinner. The Conference then sat as a whole to hear three presentations dealing with the identification of implementation issues of MCE.

Paul J. Sullivan, Director of the Ethical Reasoning Project, Tacoma Public Schools, stressed the need to gain the support of a variety of groups (religious, parental, administrative) when installing MCE programs. Allied to this need is the importance of public-relations activities sensitive to local perceptions. He cautioned that using educational jargon, particularly regarding theoretical issues, is a barrier to acceptance. With regard to personnel engaged in MCE, the project head should be fully qualified and be engaged in the installation process from its inception. He identified the "inculcation" spectre and perceived threat to religious dogmas as two major barriers to overcome. Installation of MCE inevitably involves a total school system, and one must be prepared to deal with reservations on the part of teachers, building principals, and central administration. Finally, Dr. Sullivan strongly recommended the establishment of a citizen advisory group to deal with local concerns and MCE policy.

Edwin Fenton, Director of Carnegie-Mellon (University) Education Center, stressed the need to develop a coherent rationale for MCE and place it in the wider context of school programs, since the "moral" label arouses community resistance. It is more feasible to integrate MCE with the regular curriculum, e.g., civics, social studies, English, in terms of acceptance and student interest. Teachers should be coleaders in MCE and receive help in the form of administrative support at all levels, materials, and in-service training. Dr. Fenton emphasized the need to

bring some coherence between the coexisting "hidden" and formal curricula. MCE must involve the wider community and parents. Finally, MCE advocates must get into the schools, look at the practical realities, and see it the "way it is" — thus avoiding unrealistic long-term schemes.

Glenn E. Snelbecker, Temple University, (representing the American Psychological Association), emphasized the need to use research knowledge in MCE development efforts. Educational engineers are needed, as well as support for their efforts. The contributions of learned professions should play a part in the development of MCE programs. Dr. Snelbecker pointed to some impediments to MCE, including the current lack of "payoff" (rank, money) for professionals engaged in it. Finally, he circulated several summary papers dealing with knowledge production and utilization, views concerning a general educational research and development program, and ideas and issues emanating from the field of psychology.

For the next hour and a half work groups reassembled in brainstorming sessions to explore and refine their perception of implementation issues, and these were reported to and discussed by the total Conference.

Sunday. Business opened Sunday morning with Russell A. Hill, Conference director, offering further guidelines for addressing implementation issues. His remarks can be outlined as follows:

- This section of the agenda deals with possible processes, procedures, and structures to actualize MCE; the hoped for outcomes are specific implementation recommendations to be submitted to potential funders.
- There are two assumptions:
 - (a) Funding for the program will continue, either by NIE, private foundations, or a combination of the two.
 - (b) There is a growing interest in MCE, requiring us to take action now.
- The following "laundry list" of possible issues are suggested:
 - (a) Public Policy
 - (1) Build a broad constituency and, through polling or other

techniques, carry out activities which reflect their concerns.

- (2) Project short-run (1 - 2 years) policy activities.
- (3) Conduct a series of hearings or miniconferences to gather opinions about and refine policy issues.

(b) Theory

- (1) Communicate across field - problems, issues, criticisms, caveats - and break through invisible colleges, separate camps.
- (2) Conduct series of symposia to focus on identifying and synthesizing theoretical positions; possible techniques might include contractual or RFP procedures and commissioning special papers and tasks.

(c) Research

- (1) Communicate across fields.
- (2) Invest in analysis and/or development of measures if this is perceived as a priority need.
- (3) Conduct experimental research; replicate and test existing research findings.
- (4) Examine mechanisms for research activities, e.g., a center for MCE research.

(d) Development and Dissemination

- (1) Consider tying in with the state level, where federal monies are now being focused.
- (2) Develop communication network or system (in and out) across the field, including consideration of publishing a newsletter.
- (3) Examine ways of interrelating governmental and private funding sources, e.g., NIE research, Office of Education development.

- The career-education model of growth, experience, and organization might be considered as one R, D, and D implementation guide.

Work groups then met again, this time to formulate implementation recommendations. These recommendations were reported to the entire Conference, with Louis Rubin, University of Illinois, acting as moderator at both the reporting session and the subsequent reaction session by members of the Advisory Group.

The final Conference session was a wrap-up lunch featuring two events. First, Ralph W. Tyler, Science Research Associates, presented a schema for introducing MCE in the schools. His remarks can be summarized as follows:

- There is a need to understand the public school structure and system.
 - (a) The responsibility for adopting new educational directions and programs resides at the school district level.
 - (b) MCE will require teacher training, since teachers will have to learn a new way of and new approach to instruction.
 - (c) Local schools themselves must feel the need for MCE; a program handed down from above will not work.
- There is a need to identify and analyze differing problems across communities, e.g.,
 - (a) in areas where children have "moral" deficiencies - e.g., high delinquency
 - (b) in areas where children's "moral" behavior is adequate
 - (c) in areas where children's "moral" behavior is adequate, but the community is aroused and wants further improvement in this domain
- A starting point might be to identify a local district that has recognized a real MCE need and defined areas of particular importance. We could then offer the school or school system technical assistance in the form of R, D, and D guidance and perhaps materials (although teacher-developed materials might be a beneficial precursor). This small-scale start is the most feasible approach.
- Following a demonstration project, other schools feeling a need

could ally themselves to the technical-assistance program, thus forming a cooperative group which would spread outward to other localities (such a procedural model being based on agricultural demonstration projects).

Finally, participants filled out and returned both their individual questionnaires dealing with personal judgments concerning MCE issues and recommendations and an end-of Conference questionnaire dealing with the degree to which the participants thought the Conference had met its objectives.

Conference Recommendations

Introduction

This section brings together the major MCE recommendations derived from the Conference. They are categorized according to the focus of the work groups: public policy, theory, research, development, and dissemination. Each category is followed by a brief statement of recommendations highlights prepared by the MCE staff. The last section contains selected comments on implementation issues gleaned from the animated brainstorming session Saturday night.

It should be emphasized that many of the recommendations and reactions do not fit neatly into a single category. Nearly all of them overlap, interact with, and/or impact on other categories, so that in many cases sorting them was a matter of emphasis or, occasionally, a frankly arbitrary choice. The categorization is simply intended to lend some order to the rich source materials. In point of fact, the interacting nature of the recommendations and reactions is one of their strengths, indicating both the range of the participants' interests and their awareness of the interlocking relationship of the factors involved in MCE.

The recommendations were derived from several Conference inputs: the four major Conference presentations, the work-group reports, the discussion by reactant panels, discussion from the floor, the brainstorming session and discussion Saturday evening, responses to the individual questionnaires, and comments on the first draft of the Conference proceedings which was mailed to all participants. Melding this heady brew is no mean task, and we ask the reader's indulgence in our attempt to do so.

A final note should be added regarding the format of this section: Recommendations are recorded in the more or less colloquial language in which they were spoken or written -- in many cases verbatim -- to reflect the spontaneity of Conference output.

PUBLIC POLICY

Need for definition of moral behavior/MCE

- The Conference can make real accomplishments by proceeding without waiting for the perfect (and perfectly agreed upon) definition of justice or moral behavior.
- The definition of moral/citizenship education is important. Whichever words we use, it is important not to rely on the connotation evoked in people, but to make up our own definitions, which would then always accompany the name or title of our activities. In a sense, then, any kind of dissemination (and attempts to gain funding, etc.) would be educative activities.
- We need better labels and better definitions of MCE concepts to enhance communications, even if the labels do not command/receive complete agreement.
- We must define moral behavior/experience and differentiate it from other kinds of experience as a necessary first step to action. What do various constituencies mean by the term and what kinds of action do they want?
- There is a need for a clear definition of moral behavior; several of those offered at the Conference are not satisfactory (e.g., curb impulses and self-interest; base morality on common values in our culture).
- We must be clear about our conception of MCE before we can justify/promise it.
- The best definition of MCE appeared in Hunt/Metcalf in 1955. I am surprised that no one mentioned this at the Conference. Metcalf was too modest to be self-serving.

Need for definition of MCE goals

- There is a need to define the MCE goal.
- We've got to have some goals we can agree upon; otherwise the possibility of strength through synergy is lost.
- We must clarify the goals and outcomes of MCE -- where we go from here, and how best to collaborate. Where does citizenship fit in, if at all?
- The Conference can make real accomplishments by developing a definition of what we're doing, tied in with goals/objectives, i.e., designing a defensible product (the title is less important).
- We must distinguish between maximal and minimal goals.

- The Conference can make real accomplishments by translating the goal (to help youth and adults understand and act in accordance with principles of freedom, justice, and equality) into more specific subgoals: determining what we are teaching for; teaching skills, attitudes, etc., that can be measured on a psychological profile.
- State universal values in layman's terms and tie them into existing legal documents, e.g., Bill of Rights. Universal values might include:
 - (a) respect for dignity of the individual
 - (b) equality of opportunity
 - (c) system of law and order

We should aim at doing better what we are doing or what we say we are doing, stressing democratic decision-making.
- The Conference can make real accomplishments by establishing that our goal is to help youth and adults understand and act in accordance with the principles of freedom, justice, and equality as defined in the Bill of Rights and UN Charter on the Rights of Man.
- A basic M/C trait might be defined as "the ability to curb one's impulse and self-interest out of sensitivity to others and the community" (of course self-interest and the interest of the community can coincide).
- We seem to be concerned about what components should be included in the curriculum without trying to first answer the question "What kind of person should be the end product of the schools (and home and church)?" or "What personal qualities should pupils have as they enter adulthood?"

Issues relating to "moral/citizenship education" as a label

- "Moral/citizenship education" as a title can be sold; "moral education" cannot. Avoid such red-flag slogans.
- It seems to me that you might scrap the awkward "Moral/Citizenship" term and try something like "Civil Morality."
- There was disagreement about a program title. Some felt that we should call the program what it is and confront the "red flag" issue head on. Others argued for "sellability" of the title.
- We spent 3 Conference days quibbling about the term "Moral/Citizenship Education." That is a major problem.
- We should not link moral and citizenship education with the MCE label. For research and conference purposes moral education has greater specificity. In the community, each region should use whatever label seems prudent.

- The debate on the title is important, but not overly important. I suggest you ask a panel to write a position paper which would conclude with a recommendation for a name.
- With regard to the definitions and domains of moral and citizenship, an effort should be made to develop a basic description/characterization of what we are doing. The emphasis of the Conference appears to be on moral rather than citizenship, though there may be policy pitfalls in using the term moral.
- The concept of self-development (which implies moral development) is more sellable and will engender less resistance than moral development.
- I think there's a need for further developing, rather than abandoning, the relationship between moral and citizenship education -- and gathering data on public perceptions of and attitudes toward different labels for and explanations of this endeavor. Ultimately, we should settle on something which is not only good from the public relations standpoint but which also does justice to our aims and potential contribution. (Any definition which links moral to citizenship education without covering everything included in the latter can simply make it clear that only a part of what's needed to be an effective citizen is encompassed here.)
- There is certainly rich common ground between moral and citizenship education, and it would be a serious mistake not to anchor the one in the other.

Issues relating to public reaction and support

- Society is going to use the schools as the locus for the debate about synthesizing the pluralism we represent, since the church and other institutions have been disestablished in this respect. Therefore, we should not think simplistically that MCE is another educational program. It involves complex issues of social policy and change.
- Major task at this point is the development and implementation of a public-awareness and support-building effort about values education in particular and education in general. We have all made too many assumptions about growth and continued support. These are slightly challenged now by public-reaction -- but this might be nothing compared to the demands from social service areas in the future, as children and youth are a smaller portion of the population.
- We need to assess and legitimize the MCE need and objectives, on a national basis, and develop a rational priority mandate (as opposed to preaching).
- The issue of reasonable standards and accountability must be addressed. We must have justification for what we are doing.
- It is important to limit the parameters of what we're engaged in, if not to change the actual title, to avoid religious antagonism and court action.

- The mandate from the local level to do something will probably never be stronger -- but patience and moving at something near the speed for which they are ready are essential.
- The public (users) wants "something" in MCE. We must help to identify this want rather than assume the posture of experts selling a bill of goods.
- It is vital to consider how community people perceive our efforts and to avoid projecting negative images, e.g., "on cloud 9."
- For millions of Americans, no theory will ever meet the test unless the moral principles of the Bible are somehow incorporated. If they are right, there should be a way to gather evidence to support them.
- MCE will be going forward regardless; so we cannot defer policy recommendations.
- Because of the breakdown of the neighborhood school and the family-neighborhood connection, schools must, and are expected to, carry out MCE.

Issues relating to governmental role

- One approach might be to use governmental funding to develop procedures, at the school district level, for helping schools to identify their MCE needs and desires and to act on them.
- This area is as big as life itself. While the experts at this Conference are an important element, perhaps their input will account for only 10%-20% of what is actually done about the moral education of Americans. I would seek to put the schools in a "partnership" role with other community agencies (government, business, law enforcement, churches, community youth service groups, etc.), not as the leader. I would seek to engage the people at this Conference as "servants/resource persons" to these community groups, not as experts/leaders.
- Government agencies should view themselves as service organizations -- responding to, not directing, the expressed wants, the needs, and the requests of the public. Government agencies should not be in the marketing business, independently imposing materials, etc., on the schools.
- The Conference is well-advised to pursue the local option approach, since national "mandates" do not bring results.
- The emphasis -- not surprisingly -- at the Conference was on the role of "Washington" and National Foundations. Important as this is, for the long run we need, I think, to consider strategies for the education, mobilization, etc., of state and city panels.

Concerns regarding indoctrination and related issues

- MCE can easily become merely a tool of indoctrination and, therefore, of exploitation. (MCE will necessarily have some of those elements if it is carried out in state-supported schools. The theory and research people at the Conference are not the sort who want indoctrination to replace education as the goal of MCE. But development people are nearly always that sort. They have to get results. They'll take the Kohlberg scale and develop a training program which will spread the range of scores at any "stage." They, therefore, are more responsive to power than theorists and researchers.) Suggestions: For both moral and civic reasons, make sure the indoctrination is minimized in developing and developed programs of MCE.
- Secularism and separation of church and state should underlie MCE; a religious overtone and inculcation of the values of particular religions should be excluded. Home and religious schools can balance the MCE secularism and tie MCE in with particular faiths.
- With regard to separation of church and state and the espousal of particular (religious-based) values, no sectarian values should be promoted. The aim is to serve the largest possible community, as indicated in the definition of a M/C trait.
- The tension between moral training and moral education must be resolved. Related issues include: the question of indoctrination; the relationship between moral training and moral judgment; readiness of schools, and the community to criticize mores.
- We should not expect or allow schools to become the surrogate conscience of society.
- We must determine the ethical and policy implications of measuring moral behavior and of our MCE interventions.
- Should exemptions be made for those parents/children opposed to MCE? In this regard, how about "mainlining" MCE into the curriculum?
- There is pressure on school districts to offer some kind of MCE. They will do it anyway regardless of our activities. This offers us an opportunity to provide a leadership role in what they will do in response to the pressures.

Need for historical perspective

- We in values education talk so much about this approach and that approach that we have tended to ignore 3,000 years of philosophy, religion, and ethics in Western civilization. Perhaps the stuff of philosophical presentation is too much for us. But we need a more concerted effort with philosophers and ethicists.

- Citizenship education has a history. Without a knowledge of that history many mistakes will be repeated.
- We need to be familiar with the long history of moral education – the literature, concepts, controversies, etc. – before beginning to formulate policy.
- We must come to grips with the difficult task of differentiating moral experience from other kinds of experience (distinction between moral and nonmoral, moral and immoral). What do we mean by, e.g., moral judgments, moral principles, moral commitments? What, in the long history of ethics, can help us with this clarification?
- What is the existing public policy with respect to moral and civic education, as compared with past policies?

Highlights

- A major focus of these recommendations is the need to conceptualize, define, set goals for, "label, " and justify MCE. Public acceptability and public perceptions are involved in these considerations. Determining universal values which will not violate the rights of ethnic or sectarian groups is seen as a priority task. Considerable emphasis is placed on the "ethical" implications of MCE, with the caution repeatedly expressed that it must not be indoctrinative.
- The major opinion seems to be that a "national mandate" handed down from a governmental agency would not be effective, nor would a down-from-the-top "marketing" approach. Most feel that a MCE program must engage the participation of interested, allied agencies (e.g., religious groups) and avoid an overbearing leadership role.
- The impact of political, economic, and social influences, and their potential for forwarding or fettering a MCE program, must be taken into account in all phases of policy formulation.
- There is a need for a historical study and analysis of past MCE-like efforts in order to avoid past mistakes and build on past successes.
- Finally, the input of multidisciplinary experts should be sought in this delicate but vital area.

THEORY

Basic theoretical issues

- Theory development should be oriented toward the interface between moral theory and citizenship education. Both of these topics are broader and coalesce with other disciplines, and they should be distinguished both for theoretical and applied reasons. At any rate, theory development in this area should be delineated.
- We need a theory of determinants of both moral behavior and development. What individual characteristics (including moral judgment, values, as well as others) lead people to act morally? How do such characteristics develop, and what conditions further them?
- Those involved with moral education are and will remain strongly interested in moral cognition, moral reasoning, and valuing. But moral conduct is crucially relevant. Therefore, theory should specify relationships between moral thinking and moral conduct (and morally relevant affects).
- In theory-building we must explore basic assumptions regarding: the nature of man, the nature of a moral act, the moral point of view, personhood, how a person learns most adequately. There is still a great deal of fuzziness about what one is doing or ought to do based upon this lack of precision about controversial theories. There must be a clear statement regarding what we are talking about and why these things are important. A well-designed rationale is extremely important.
- Theory development in the U.S.A. proceeds as if we possess a sufficiently rational, clear, and shared idea of what makes an idea, judgment, action, etc., a moral one or that it is impossible to develop such a consensus. Philosophers have been absent from theory formation. Our responsibility, then, is to seek out the few good ones and make the space for them.
- Self-development and moral development cannot be separated.
- Theory has mainly concentrated on "moral" development. We need theory development for broader areas, e.g., socialization.
- We must analyze and subdivide theory:
 - (a) theory of what determines moral conduct and characteristics:
 - moral cognition
 - affect
 - competencies
 - (b) theory of development and promotion:
 - How do moral characteristics develop?
 - How can moral characteristics be promoted and taught?

- In implementing MCE, we need to understand theories of social change as a basis for planning.
- An attempt to maintain a generational (lifespan) perspective in theory-building is important.
- Theoretical bases considered at the Conference were mainly psychological. Are they adequately representative of psychological theories? We are satisfied that the philosophical approach called cognitive decision is the only philosophical position worth considering. The sociological, political, and economic bases necessary for an adequate theoretical foundation for MCE should not be neglected.
- Should MCE facilitate all actions that persons make which are based on "moral reasoning," or are there limits?
- While it seems clear that existing theoretical development has not yet been put to good applied use, it is equally clear that additional theoretical endeavors are needed. I would suggest that under RBS stewardship, efforts be made to coordinate a variety of theoretical investigations in each of those areas where experts believe our conceptual understanding is scant.
- Few, if any, restrictions should be suggested for theory development.

Goals and objectives

- There is a need to specify what key elements of theory are needed, e.g., the problems, the goals of moral/values education, the behavioral objectives, etc., in a minimal form which most can agree upon. Then it becomes a matter of testing which methods achieve the goals best for what populations in what kind of situations.
- We must ask, and distinguish between, two questions:
 - (a) What elements should be included in a MCE curriculum?
 - (b) What type of student should come out of a MCE curriculum?

In addressing these issues, we must be cautious about engaging in indoctrination and about recognizing the limitations of MCE treatment.
- To arrive at theories relevant to MCE, we should determine goals and relate theories to goals as criteria (the variables to be explained).
- We need to work toward a theory (or theories) that take as its end goal the explanation of desired educational outcomes. This implies further defining of the desired educational outcomes, preferably in terms that can be measured, then working backwards to develop theories of factors or variables that relate to these goals. I believe present theories have their own goals and, therefore, may not be relevant to desired educational outcomes. The work may draw from the present theories (and research), but the phenomena to be explained would be educational goals.

Comparison, analysis, and, where possible, synthesis of various theoretical positions

- An interdisciplinary attempt to integrate the cognitive-decision, development, prosocial, and values theories would be most helpful at this stage of the art.
- It would be helpful to examine whether or not the specific recommendations from the four different sorts of theorists -- cognitive decision, developmental, prosocial, and values -- cohere with one another. The way to get agreement among these diverse sorts of theorists is not by making them change their theories but by linking together their respective conclusions, findings, recommendations, etc., which agree with one another. A philosopher of education seems especially equipped to locate such linkages.
- A priority should be to stimulate the continued and increased synthesis among the various theoretical positions.
- I believe at this stage every effort should be made to maintain a catholic stance toward theory in moral education. The RBS Project or NIE should not support any one theoretical position to the exclusion of others.
- It would be very helpful to have a compilation of theories. No one theory answers all the questions involved in teaching and learning in the area of MCE. It needs to be written so teachers and parents can understand it.
- We need a synthesis of the major theoretical positions, the intent being to fuse them into an eclectic whole, with each contributing to that whole in a noncompetitive fashion.
- Each theory seems to have several pieces of truth, but no single approach seems able to give complete insight into such a complicated area of life.
- Knowledge of interrelationship among theories is requisite for those working with MCE; we should aim at integrating and/or coordinating theories.
- We must beware giving too much attention to too few theories of valuing.
- Two types of theory activities (at least) should be encouraged and funded:
 - (a) description and analysis of the "four approaches" (of this Conference), plus, perhaps, others
 - (b) a state-of-the-art description of ways in which theories are similar and different
- We should regard the four theoretical approaches as complementary. In short, the developmental approach provides the basic framework; cognitive theory focuses on and elaborates higher levels of moral development; the prosocial approach emphasizes the lower levels of moral development; and values clarification appears to be a potentially useful tool in fostering individuals' progress through the stages of moral development.

- It seems that the work of Staub and Kohlberg, although up to now going on separate tracks, is beginning to converge as real-life situations become more effective means for development, response to, and discussion of moral dilemmas and as real-life involvement, the exploration of consequences, and interactive models become key features in promoting prosocial behavior. Values clarification as a process, though not an adequately developed theory base, provides concrete activities for discussion and application raised by issues and problems raised by the earlier noted movements. The possibility for convergence is exciting (if group loyalties do not interfere) and should be explored.
- It is possible that a certain type of personality development in children has to take place if moral cognition is to be effectively fostered. Maybe this is the point at which "synthesis" of prosocial "theory" and cognitive approaches could be accomplished.
- The four theoretical approaches discussed at the Conference are more complementary than antithetical (e.g., prosocial concentrates on process in early years, developmental concentrates on longitudinal processes at later time, cognitive deals with criteria for higher stages).

Relationship to research data-base

- Theory and research must be connected. If this is not now so, we should take steps to make it so, focusing on MCE goals.
- The connections between specific research and applied projects and theory should always be specified, so that applications will contribute to the development and the testing of theory.
- Theory evolves as an effort to interpret empirical data. New efforts to provide MCE will produce data that will stimulate theory formulation. Theory development is not effectively forced.
- We need regular opportunities to share theory and research, but consensus on the theoretical level is a prerequisite to action.

Relationship to field experience in real world

- Theory and practice must mutually interact.
- Productive practical theory must grow not only out of the perspectives of moralists, philosophers, and psychologists but also out of the real-world perceptions of the public and of practitioners. We cannot cavalierly exclude from consideration the extant and emerging efforts we call drug education, sex education, alcohol education, etc. How can one ignore the range of "alternative" schools in both public and private settings which purport to impact on student character and behavior, as well as the specialized programs assigned to "deviant" students?

- A more deliberate focus on building theory from practice, and vice versa, is needed.
- Again the theory/practice bridge is necessary. A generational curriculum model helps keep the focus.
- There are three needs related to theory-building:
 - (a) recognition of school-community interaction
 - (b) need for theory and practice to gibe
 - (c) need for responsible evaluation for future theory-building
- The theorist might be induced to dwell upon the possibility of implementing MCE on an institutional level. The effects of values clarification on an institution, the development of moral standards at an institutional level, should have promise for MCE.

Highlights

- The dominant emphasis in these recommendations is the call for synthesis of, or at least an attempt at establishing relationships among, the chief theoretical positions. Implicit in this is the unwillingness to accept and support a single theoretical position to the exclusion of valuable contributions from others. The complementary nature of theoretical stances is seen as a strength that should be explored and analyzed in depth.
- There is also a call for consideration of an even broader perspective from which to study and explain MCE phenomena.
- Several other themes relate to the connection (or lack of it) between theory and the real world. Recommendations emphasize the need for theory to relate to, e.g., research and practice, as well to seek input from other fields, e.g., philosophy. The determination of goals, in the real-world context, is also mentioned as a prerequisite for effective MCE theory-building.

RESEARCH

Overview

- We need precise research about:
 - (a) the scope of concern
 - (b) the outcomes expected from instruction or programs
 - (c) measures of need and outcome
 - (d) the real state of practice
 - (e) the real need(s), if any
 - (f) the public's perceptions
 - (g) the motivation/expectations of MCE education
- The following needs are paramount:
 - (a) a critical overview of what has been and is being done in MCE
 - (b) knowledge of effects on individuals of different educational means and experiences
 - (c) examples of effective means and materials, e.g., demonstration projects
 - (d) practitioners who can lead and implement MCE efforts
 - (e) an applied process of R & D involving a large number of practitioners
 - (f) provision of as much help to parents as to teachers
 - (g) a network of socializing institutions involved in MCE, not just schools
- This also leads to a research question: Will children with different personality characteristics (levels of self-esteem, intellectual and behavioral competencies, etc.) which result from different past experiences (nurturance, etc.) learn to different degrees from moral education programs which emphasize cognitive learning -- judgment, valuing, etc.? Probably yes, and if so, that has reflection back on theory and the need for a broad conceptual framework.
- We need to look for and stress links between research on "moral" thought and action, and research on other aspects of social and affective development.

Need for statement of existent research data

- We need graphic and verbal descriptions of various studies which show (in toto) how different patterns of interventions do or do not lead to different patterns of effects.
- We need a review of research literature and description of "what we now know" in layman's language (not jargon).
- Do we know enough about the range of views concerning MCE? If so, has this knowledge been sufficiently disseminated? It would be desirable to see an identification of target skills and outcomes -- derived from dialogues among researchers, philosophers, and curriculum and school administrators.

Ways of carrying out research

- I think we need to know which groups in the country feel how about moral and ethical education and with what intensity. We need, further, to know what they feel the appropriate role of the school is in moral education and what areas would provoke public controversy. Out of a national survey could come instruments and approaches that would be applicable on a local or state level. At this point, we don't know what the American people really think about the issue of the school taking a more active role in moral education, and we should know that before we go much further. Second, it would seem that the most appropriate role, given a state of knowledge in this field, would be for the Federal government to help local groups and agencies to deal with it. Certainly, though, there is a role for the Federal government supporting a variety of research projects in this area, but first, I think, they need to analyze the dimensions of the problem.
- Research should be guided by clear statements of derived educational outcomes. Two kinds of research would be helpful. First (and prior to the second), research could help determine desired MCE goals. Several research methods could be used: philosophical analysis by philosophy of education specialists, survey and interview of criterion groups (setters of desired educational outcomes), and researcher measures of the goals -- to determine their measurement adequacy. Second, research should test the theory (theories) of MCE.
- Development should also be related to desired educational goals and, where possible, related to theory. It would be ideal if the theory-building research and development could be coordinated. This implies communication of the specifics of each activity to the others engaged in the three activities. Semiannual or annual problem/progress workshops, and focused use of present (and new) newsletters and journals (JME, e.g.), might help.
- Research must be done to increase understanding of MCE processes as they currently exist and as they existed in earlier epochs, so that we can learn from the past and place future plans in a historical context.
- We need careful and sustained testing of the hypothesis that using the procedures outlined in the 1971 NCSS Yearbook as a means to improve moral reasoning would foster moral maturity as measured by Kohlberg's stages. A caveat: Moral educators tend to expect too much too soon. A year of instruction before testing for results would be appropriate.
- It is important to fund a variety of projects -- small-scale ones with a very sharply defined focus as well as large-scale efforts seeking to explore many questions and interactions among factors.
- A research component in a program of MCE must exemplify in organizational structure, in its internal affairs, and in its every contact with the larger public the same ethical and political principles proposed as objectives of MCE. We do not know any instance of research activity in psychology or sociology which could pass that test.

Relationship of research to practice

- We need to identify the bases for MCE research findings, e.g., what is the relationship of laboratory studies to the real world?
- Basic and applied research should be more closely integrated with what is happening in the field.
- If research is to be effective, it must take into account eventual implementation techniques.
- Research should be designed with the concerns of the practitioner in mind -- what will be done with the findings?
- There has to be a marriage of basic and applied research. Certainly one might be able to gather such a team with the appropriate funding and long-range goals.
- Research should be based on the principle of praxis. Theory and practice (applied) should not be separated -- a theory in this area should be a reflection (theory) on arguing action. Praxis is reflection-action, etc. Development is praxis.
- Research funding and projects must be tied directly to the concerns, needs, and current practices of local school districts. This could be done by bringing together those who are implementing programs and those interested in practical research on the effects of such programs. The meeting would be beneficial to both groups.
- Research projects should be based upon strategies and materials that have some chance of public acceptance. Ultimately they should be conducted in real schools, in contrast to small samples in a laboratory situation.
- Research needs to be field-based, with a formative model of evaluation.

Need for research with a diversity of foci

- Practitioners/consumers/school governors/news-media people would be excellent advisors to research decisions.
- We might hire a moral philosopher to serve as member of any research organization.
- Many experts seem to be unaware of other vital components or dimensions of the entire area; there is a need for an umbrella group or area, e.g., curriculum developers to synthesize these fragments.
- Even though Kohlberg and Staub have carried out some research, research which might spring from more comprehensive or more inclusive theory is lacking and needed. Major barriers include funding and, in some cases, issues surrounding human rights.

- Research in moral-citizenship education is perhaps unique in that it is essential that a broad scope of problems be attacked from a variety of vantage points. As a consequence, it is most important that diversity in approach, and eclecticism in methodology, be preserved to the widest possible degree.
- Clearly, we ought to support basic research in each of the theoretical frameworks.
- Perhaps it is time to seek rapprochement between different spheres of research. A model for such a move might be R. S. Peters's paper on the relationship of Piagetian theory to that of Freud. Might there be more of this?
- It is important that research projects and research-project implementers of all sorts be grounded in a developmental point of view and that researchers have at least some acquaintance with the major theories and projects that exist before they reinvent the wheel.

Need for study of environment of the learner

- There is a need to identify and analyze differing problems across communities:
 - (a) areas where children have "moral" deficiencies — e.g., high delinquency
 - (b) areas where children's "moral" behavior is adequate
 - (c) areas where children's "moral" behavior is adequate, but the community is aroused and wants further improvement in this domain
- We need to know a lot more about moral thinking and behavior. For all the attention given to "moral reasoning," for example, we still know very little about how people make actual moral decisions in a real-life context (quite a different thing from what one does on a hypothetical dilemma when pushed to the ceiling of one's reasoning capacity by an interviewer). We need good naturalistic research. Many good ideas about what we ought to study will come from watching good teachers at work — how do they deal with rules, discipline, discussion, and so on?
- We should collect examples of students' moral discourse for the purpose of identifying examples of their mistakes in moral reasoning. We could begin by selecting pilot schools within which student discourse could be recorded and studied. Once student mistakes are located, instructional materials for both teachers and students would have to be developed and tested.
- We need surveys to discover what students believe to be moral values . . . whom (by type of person) they look up to as moral examples . . . and how they feel about the need for MCE in the schools.
- We need to collect more examples of the kind of moral reasoning children engage in.

- We should nurture policy research on MCE -- e.g., research that focuses on variables that are teachable in the context of the classroom. (Note that policy research is but one type of applied research.)
 - The American school system has fostered and supports the existence of a peer culture that is relatively isolated from and independent of the input of adult authority. We need some research on how to modify the structural properties of the school environment so that the values of the adult community can be passed on through the insulating effects of the peer community. That is, given that a commitment is made to do moral/citizenship education, this can only be done effectively if one discovers ways to break through the defenses of the adolescent counter-culture.
 - We need research to identify moral behavior in schools and attempt to explain its bases, i.e., family, religious beliefs, instructional programs, etc.
 - There is a need to conduct research on the influence of broader environmental factors on MCE. This larger-context approach will be more fruitful than a narrower focus, e.g., teacher-pupil interaction.
 - We should emphasize research into the societal factors that operate in the school's attempt to do moral education -- some of the research could elicit theories about these factors and their operation. Perhaps methods other than opinion polls could be devised for studying these factors.
 - What happens in the laboratory or even in contrived specific situations is important to know -- but the MCE domain is wide and everyday activities need to be measured too.
 - It is important to explore the influence of the general conditions of the child's life which might facilitate or retard moral development: the degree of autonomy and democracy; the child's experiences; nurturance versus hostility; whether reasonable control and guidance is provided to children, etc.
 - We need multivariate analyses involving various independent variables and various dependent variables.
 - Basic research is needed on:
 - (a) character development under conditions of our present society
 - (b) experiments with environmental modifications
- Applied research is needed to study the experimental efforts.

Need for research on broader environment

- The experts doing research in public education should also be conducting research in nonpublic education. We need more research in religious education. What is learned there may be helpful to public moral education, as research in public education has helped religious education.

- Research on moral education should not be restricted to studies of schools, since much ME takes place outside of the classroom -- TV, Boy & Girl Scouts, churches, etc.

Need for study of values

- There is a need to conduct research to identify the cultural values that are widely shared in our pluralistic society.
- We need a cross-national survey of ethnic/regional values to determine what, if any, values are held in common among Maine fishermen, Kansas farmers, Texas cowboys, Chinese laundrymen, etc. This kind of information seems absolutely essential as a prerequisite to doing moral education.

Need for research on teacher-training

- We need a program of research in teacher training -- i.e., what are the best and most effective ways to teach teachers to teach values, citizenship, and morality?
- There is a need for research on teacher-training for MCE.

Need for longitudinal studies

- We need longitudinal studies that extend from 3-10 years, with a task force of knowledgeable members covering the spectrum of theory, techniques, practice, and measurement, in other words, good curriculum developers.
- A greater stress needs to be placed on longitudinal studies.
- There is a need for longitudinal MCE research.
- We need ongoing longitudinal research about our knowledge, activities, measures, techniques, and goals -- to determine what will have direct or indirect impact on education.

Need for development of measures

- Funding is needed for the development of assessment measures for various MCE approaches, with outcomes reported at a conference in about 2 years or less.
- We should endorse the development of specific common research instruments which could be used with a sampling of values/moral education programs.
- We need instruments -- but only after we decide what is important and/or ethical to measure.

- A common set of assessment techniques is important: of thought, feelings, behavior. This is important in research, and to evaluate applied projects. If applied projects are carefully evaluated, they will also serve as research programs.
- There are two priorities:
 - (a) Develop some good instruments to compare effectiveness of various approaches to values education.
 - (b) Conduct that research.
- We need a program of research to develop a range of measures (tests) to be used in evaluating/justifying MCE programs. The measurement base underlying this field is inadequate.
- It is important to develop common assessment instruments, including consideration of variables.
- Measures of need and outcome should be the highest priority.
- We need to develop key measures (not necessarily obtrusive ones), or refine existing ones, to assess to what extent we're attaining our goal.
- We need to develop new measures for determining MCE outcomes, and this may require nontraditional evaluation instruments if we are focusing on what a child does, not what he knows.
- We must be aware of the conceptual framework underlying the work of investigators and the programs resulting from them, so that appropriate instruments can be designed.

Highlights

- Three main themes emerge here. First is the widely expressed call for common measures, perhaps developed *do novo*, for the MCE field -- a recommendation which is repeated consistently, with variations in emphasis and language. Second is the variously expressed recognition of the need to relate research to the environment, the field, the community, and practice in the real world, including research to directly assess local community conditions, needs, perceptions, and concerns. Third, longitudinal research is seen as a priority (although not to the exclusion of short-term studies). Four, the need to study the environment of the learner is stressed.
- While research must be based on some conceptual framework, it is urged that diversity and eclecticism be pursued -- leading to the ancillary recommendation that there be some mechanism for reviewing and coordinating research activities. New research foci are proposed, including research on teacher-training.
- Research must connect with theory, practice, etc., and pay attention to the potential contribution of a historical perspective to, e.g., goal-setting in MCE.

DEVELOPMENT

Overview

- The scope of development is huge:
 - (a) developing a definition of educational objectives
 - (b) casting the community school in the role of a socializing institution
 - (c) training children to approach moral problems on a rational, principled basis, not on the basis of self-interest
 - (d) training teachers in effective MCE instruction, taking into account both the explicit and the hidden curriculum
 - (e) avoiding a cajoling, exhorting approach
 - (f) influencing not only schools and communities, but also colleges of education
- We should consider the implications of the "developmental psychology perspective" for MCE.
- For purposes of developing MCE, it might be pragmatically and politically wise to view development as a project with identifiable stages and to label each stage in accordance with its main (though not exclusive) focus. In that it is commonly easier to garner financial support for a 2-year rather than 8-year project, for example, a "staged" development might be more feasible. To continue the example, consider the following two-year stages:
 - Stage 1 Basic Research on MCE
 - Stage 2 Policy Research on MCE
 - Stage 3 MCE Program Development
 - Stage 4 MCE into Practice

Need for inclusion of a wide diversity of theoretical perspectives in development

- Persons representing differing theoretical positions should join together to solve real community problems. Thus a theoretical synthesis would result from different approaches working together towards a common solution.
- I think there's a need for encouraging diversity -- not limiting our efforts to just the four approaches outlined at the Conference.
- It would be useful to put together a program that covers basic facilitative conditions, promotes moral reasoning and moral cognition in general, and also promotes prosocial behavior. Then, it would be useful to try out such an integrated package in a couple of field settings. This is preferable, in my opinion, to having different projects that cover different aspects of MCE.
- Mechanisms should be sought to bring together and find common ground among philosophers, psychologists, and social studies practitioners.

- The Catholic movement-toward-faith community in parochial schools exemplifies some of the things we should be striving for in MCE.
- What conditions in the schools are necessary for effective MCE? Can MCE programs which have been successful when conducted under rigorously designed conditions be translated into the public school system?

Need for assessment of community's perceptions regarding MCE

- A starting point could be to identify a local district that has recognized a real MCE need and defined areas of particular importance. We can then offer the school or school system technical assistance in the form of R, D, and D guidance and perhaps materials (although teacher-developed materials might be a beneficial precursor). This small-scale start is the most feasible approach.
- We must deal at the level of social reality and help communities deal with real problems (as opposed to a "needs assessment").
- There is a need to assess local communities' varying perceptions of MCE need.
- Develop instruments to help local school communities (broadly representative groups for a particular school or school district) identify their priorities in MCE (something like a Delphi).

Need for interaction between MCE and the community

- We must involve whole communities in what the schools are doing in MCE and establish a dialogue between the community people "out there" and us.
- We must use instruments cooperatively with a community to assess the pre-conditions that exist there: stresses, value positions, ethnic interests, etc. In this way we can build participatory forums for action.
- Work in MCE should begin by grounding itself in contemporary social problems and assess community stresses before addressing theoretical issues of implementation.
- It would be wise to do an investigation of a community before attempting to formulate a specific program for it or to implement a moral-citizenship program for it. The purpose of the investigation would be to ascertain the relevant facts of the community, to locate its moral institutions, to formulate its given moral values and principles, and to discover whatever facilities and difficulties it involves for a program of moral education. Plainly, there would be a need for a liaison person here, i.e., a person to function as a go-between to coordinate the investigation of the community and the leaders of the community and to see that the programs formulated and implemented reflect the findings of the investigation of the community. Someone trained in philosophy of education, social foundations of education, or one or two other theoretical areas of education might be suitable in this liaison role.

- We need to consider how other community groups and individuals also try to cope with MCE matters very broadly defined.
- The school and community should interact, with the school structured so that it represents a microcosm of the larger community. Allow students to choose how they will participate in the community, and vice versa, so that there is a two-way transaction.
- Schools need community input and cooperation to define, develop, and implement MCE. They can't do it in vacuo.
- Involvement in MCE should be at all levels: school personnel, parents, and community (police, minorities, business, labor). Private enterprise can play a part in supporting MCE.
- MCE will not be imposed by law, and therefore rational discourses among scholars, communities, and policy-makers must be carried out on a regular basis.

Need for local approach to MCE development

- The best approach might be at the grass-roots level, with teachers participating in MCE development from the start. The approach of developing national "brands" of MCE is far less promising.
- Development should be carried out at the local level under local control rather than at the national level.
- Local community-based development is obviously preferable (from a moral and political point of view) to the central development and dissemination model. But the latter is more likely because it's easier to control by dominant, exploiting groups in society.
- The MCE community should take a posture of readily available resource persons, on call for consultation with local groups to provide advice as to how the local groups develop their own programs to meet their own needs.
- Development should not focus on producing total programs to be implemented from the outside. There are lots of existing pieces of programs. Schools need help in adapting and locally creating programs to suit their own needs and readiness.
- There is a need to understand the public school structure and system:
 - (a) The responsibility for adopting new educational directions and programs resides at the school district level.
 - (b) MCE will require teacher-training, since teachers will have to learn a new way of and new approach to instruction.
 - (c) Local schools themselves must feel the need for MCE; a program handed down will not work.

- I was happy with the directions taken in this area: away from current projects toward local district work. Regional values education centers is a great idea.
- Experts should not be "parachuted" in and out of MCE efforts.
- Pilot schools in the various approaches would help us learn how the different approaches work in the long term, with real people.
- I suggest a kind of cooperative study -- a group of schools that undertake to work out programs -- then the provision of technical assistance.
- Program development needs to emerge on these fronts:
 - (a) micro models for pilot curricula
 - (b) supplementary curricular materials
 - (c) instructional system and organizational change materials
- Can an MCE effort be developed on a small-scale basis, e.g., the teacher functioning with a small group of professionals to develop strategies and materials?

Need for MCE materials

- The Conference can make real accomplishments by identifying key materials and methods appropriate to our goals, e.g., demonstration schools, test results, as a basis for future activities.
- I think it would be useful to gradually develop a group of procedures and related materials that would represent various aspects of an effective moral education program and that could be used for application and in applied research.
- There is little question but that a good deal of additional developmental work is needed. Apart from the ubiquitous values clarification devices, and allusions in the literature to Kohlberg theory, little in the way of tested instructional packages exist. Hence, the development of these packages -- on moral-citizenship education objectives of high priority -- should be launched as soon as possible.
- Since educators, parents, etc., are so dependent upon directives and structures, it seems crucial to have well-designed materials available for interested teachers.
- Explore feasibility and desirability of:
 - (a) developing some range of methods/techniques/materials, etc., from which local schools could choose those which are appropriate for their community
 - (b) developing an array of "components" from which local groups could "assemble" approaches appropriate for their community

- Kohlberg has only a few filmstrips, with almost no exportable programming. Even less is available from Staub. Only values clarification has made a significant impact. The cognitive-reasoning field has got to come down to the valley of experience-based as well as verbally based learning.

Suggestions for MCE content

- Emphasis should be placed on universal values, with the recognition that localities will interpret and apply them differentially, depending on local community factors. Is there a set of superordinate values that transcend varying local conditions?
- Emphasize helping persons to develop a process for making value decisions, rather than dealing with the content of those decisions. Allow the schools to define the problem and the value decisions.
- We need a conception of moral functioning that includes the three faces of morality: thinking, feeling, and doing. We want to develop people who know the good, want to do it, and act upon that knowledge and desire. Intervention efforts should, in turn, aim to stimulate growth in all three of these areas.
- Again, with regard to development, I want to emphasize that to the extent any materials and procedures are developed for use, they should include procedures that involve children in learning by doing, participation, and relevant experiences. Thus role-playing experiences (which I called "as if" participation) as well as ways of getting children involved in activities that produce genuine benefit to others could be useful (teaching others, making things for children in need, etc.).
- With regard to specific procedures, children learn a great deal by engagement in, participation in, "moral" behavior; they learn by doing, by experience. Thus the influence of participation and experience, in addition to procedures that aim at advancing moral thoughts and values, needs to be studied.

Suggestions for instructional focus

- I think there's a need for a variety of projects -- including home-school projects, efforts that reach down into the earlier years, projects that develop and test our approaches to teacher education in this area.
- We need to develop parenting materials with the same vigor as pupil materials.
- Program development, while retaining its basic scope and intent, should be based on a generational approach (preschool through adult), thus integrating different life styles into MCE.
- A focus needs to be made on development during the transition stages of growth -- with a stress on relating moral reasoning to moral behavior.

Need for integration of MCE into regular curriculum

- More attention should be paid to integrating MCE into the curriculum, in view of the conservative climate.
- Educators -- specifically specialists in curriculum and instruction -- should try and develop interventions that the typical subject-area teacher could use with a minimum amount of training and which will have not only a positive effect on the students' moral development but also upon the students' cognitive development.
- Those who advocate "Career Education" generally argue for infusion into extant curriculum rather than adding on a new instructional program. The same should work here.

Need for focus on "hidden curriculum"

- Because of opposition to MCE by certain minority groups, it seems to me as if the most productive types of curriculum interventions would be either the "hidden curriculum" or alternative teaching strategies -- such things as teacher-student verbal interactions, peer tutoring, team learning, dilemma type of materials for science, English, etc. The flow should be from the theorists, to the researcher, to the educator (curriculum development and instruction), to the teacher. Realistic curriculum types can take the MCE research and design curriculum materials and teaching strategies that would further not only MCE but also cognitive gains in specific subject areas. Similarly, changes in the total school environment -- its rules, grading, teaching, athletics -- may just impact on a student's moral development to a greater extent than values clarification, magic circles, dilemmas, etc., and will certainly be a lot less open to criticism.
- The issue is not whether schools should engage in MCE. Schools are carrying out MCE, like it or not, because teaching entails sharing of values. Therefore our task becomes how to guide either formal or "invisible" MCE.
- Moral education should be implemented in the total curriculum (including the "hidden curriculum"), although this does not preclude special MCE courses and activities in addition.
- The hidden curriculum, school structure, and role of the teacher are crucial factors.
- The "hidden curriculum" should be examined for parameters relating to MCE, and alternate curricular components should be developed that can be implemented without completely revising the existing school environment.
- In terms of educational needs, we need a continuum from analysis of moral dilemmas to experiential, self-governance learning. Both are important, but the latter may have the cutting edge in effectiveness of treatment.

Need for testing of extant and new programs

- We ought to be careful about new development. There is a greater need to test and apply what we have first.
- Entirely too much time and recognition have been given to particular approaches. We need severe testing before we get on any bandwagon.
- We must be wary of uncritically accepting MCE programs/proposals which are not based on solid research.

Need for teacher-training

- Investigate ways to help teachers sort out their own moral value system . . . so their example can more often be consistent with their words. If teachers "had it together," I wouldn't worry too much about special programs aimed at the kids -- it would happen naturally in each teacher's own style.
- Most conversations assumed we were to design programs for students. Don't ignore the teacher-focused programs.
- Have empathy for the teachers: MCE is only one of many new demands being made of them.
- Teacher-training for MCE is of prime importance. It is also a difficult task, considering the factors of teachers' personal sense of morality and ethics, personal commitment to MCE, and presence or absence of sensitivity, etc.
- The question of packaging curriculum materials is secondary to the priority need to train a teaching pool that can effectively use whatever materials are developed. We lack such a pool now.
- Teacher-training should be a major focus.
- We must solve the problem of how teachers with individual moral sets can effectively teach the same MCE materials.
- There is a need to develop materials for teacher- and parent-training.
- A focal effort should be teacher- and parent-training, including implementation guides, activities, and materials.
- We must move into teacher-training and in-service training no matter how we approach MCE.
- We have to find means to give the teaching of MCE the status of teaching reading and math.

Highlights

- There is remarkable consensus that MCE must be initiated at the local school level. Such an approach calls for an assessment of local conditions, stresses, values, and perceived needs. The school-community interaction is seen as vital. Technical assistance could be provided by on-call consultants at the local level, and the program could then spread to other communities, with adaptations to their environmental realities. A national "handed-down" program is universally condemned.
- A second and equally weighted recommendation is the call for teacher-training; teachers (as well as parents) need information, specialized instruction, and data about materials.
- There is some sense that MCE would be most effective if integrated into regular curriculum courses. However, several suggestions are made regarding MCE "package" development: that it should integrate diverse approaches; that it should build upon, not duplicate, what we already have; that it should reflect a stage process; that it should take into account MCE experiences, demonstration, and test results (not necessarily restricted to school programs) which have proven successful or unsuccessful; and that it should provide materials from which local districts could select those most appropriate.
- It is stressed that development must interact closely with theory and research.

DISSEMINATION

Overview

- Dissemination might parallel stages of "development"

Stage 1 (Basic Research on MCE)

Nature of materials disseminated: (a) general information to public on research; heavy media coverage (not unlike coverage given to some topics in medical research); (b) formal exchanges amongst research groups

Stage 2 (Policy Research on MCE)

Dissemination primarily to policy-making bodies

Nature of material: problems, findings, and prospects in policy research on MCE

Stage 3 (MCE Program Development)

Dissemination to curricular developers in particular

Stage 4 (MCE into Practice)

Dissemination focus: implementing agents (e.g., in the context of schooling, teachers)

Suggestions for organizational roles

- We should develop a clearing-house operation to facilitate access to MCE literature, e.g., more precise ERIC descriptors or perhaps a separate literature category for MCE.
- I think there's a need for something like a national conference or association for MCE, perhaps with dues-paying members; Moral Education Forum could serve as its newsletter and it could sponsor mini-conferences during the year to address particular issues like evaluation, teacher education, etc. Some vehicle is needed to continue the leadership, create visibility, keep people in touch -- in short build this into a movement that will have some staying power.
- State departments of education can be a catalyst to local districts as well as a dissemination instrument to make schools aware of methods of determining community needs and priorities as well as a variety of interventions they might explore. Universities and educational laboratories can, at that point, provide the necessary training for the programs selected by the local district.
- I would think that RBS would be a very appropriate agency for field dissemination. There is a need for some central coordination of this aspect.

- Since government and private money will continue to be limited, it is legitimate for a broadly representative group of specialists in MCE to be active consultants and "gatekeepers" where large grants are concerned. Research for Better Schools might provide an opportunity for specialists to continue to meet.
- It would be advisable to have follow-up conferences, consisting perhaps of subgroups within this first conference. The subgroups (e.g., research, theory, development) might meet separately in pursuing their interests and report back to the total group. However, care should be taken to avoid complete separation of subgroups.
- Reverse process is also important, i.e., from field to "center" (of all types -- theory, research, policy).
- We need to form a consortium, perhaps international in scope, to collaborate on continued research in MCE.
- We must devise a coordinating system to integrate and implement what we are talking about -- on a national or international level.
- We should develop a loose confederation, not a separate entity, which could meet at conferences on a regular basis and coordinate efforts. This confederation could hold dialogues with other organizations having educational units, e.g., AFL-CIO, AASA, concerning nature of and need for MCE.
- We need to develop a set of regional organizations of local theorists, state officials, and practitioners. Thus a community is established, and a pool of talent identified. You can't run programs in Arizona, Kansas, and Oregon on a large scale from Cambridge and Washington. Ultimately, there needs to be an indigenous organization.
- A MCE Center might have a triadic cooperation between the community, researchers, and a regional lab (or similar organization working at the community or regional level). Such a consortium must reflect the principles of participatory democracy, not special-interest biases.
- "Tripartite" center idea sounds worth trying.
- We must deal explicitly with how all the recommendations would be implemented. Should it be a nationally coordinated effort, or should our organizations individually seek funds for projects they want to do?
- RBS might provide leadership in MCE operations and activities. I know of no other agency in the United States that can provide such an efficient and comprehensive service. RBS has personnel that span the range of educational competencies, e.g., artists, materials development, research literature, theorists, and structures. Their advisory committee(s) should be carefully selected for both knowledge of the field and political influence.

Need for collection and dissemination of descriptive/evaluative information about MCE materials

- I recommend that NIE fund and distribute literature describing available MCE objectives/techniques/materials, etc. These descriptions should provide "consumer-oriented" information (something like, but more extensive than, Education Products Information Exchange or CEDaR Catalog information).
- Collect and disseminate best materials available.
- RBS might begin a meaningful project which would be a brief list of researchers and foundations, and identify five experiments they have heard of that sound most promising.
- We must make research and field-test findings available. So much is and has already been going on.
- Sort out the various materials in such a way that each school can intelligently select the items it wants. Try not to "market" specific curriculum materials, but provide a system for allowing individual teachers and schools to choose what best meets their needs as they have identified them.
- Programs are being introduced. Commercial firms will not wait. And while we may believe that many efforts are pedagogically weak, even harmful, we should encourage those trying programs to share their results.
- We need a historical perspective, as well as the logical and psychological ones, on the role formal schooling has had in the fields of moral training/education/citizenship. I got the impression that several teaching projects are competing for disciples and funds on the basis of their results and the publicity they have been able to command. The public and the schools need not only formal assessments of these claims, but an interpretation of their import for a variety of communal situations. Perhaps RBS could come up with a consumer's guide in this field.
- Virtually nothing of any real consequence has occurred in the way of wide-spread dissemination. In the very recent past, however, some gains have been made with respect to legitimizing the importance of moral education and dramatizing the importance of appropriate methodology. The time is therefore right, I think, for the consolidation of available research, the fabrication of the resulting implications into usable instructional packages, and the initiation of dissemination activity.

Need for use of existing dissemination channels

- Use existing channels for sharing "what is" in moral education, and what "might be."
- Dissemination needs to occur within existing school centers, community groups, and adult education classes.

- We should organize recommendations into a summary matrix and disseminate them to existing centers, e.g., AFT, teacher centers, parent groups, etc., to clarify what we know and need to know about MCE.
- We ought to make good use of the existing networks. One that I've been involved with and that would be particularly useful is teachers' centers, which have been at the cutting edge of reform both at the classroom level and the teacher education level. There are many people in that movement who would be active disseminators of MCE and whose centers offer excellent training contexts, partly because of their openness to new ideas and the respect with which they treat teachers.
- We must filter out summary recommendations through groups (minorities, parents, students, etc.) not represented at this Conference, to gain broader representation and constituency.
- The schools appear to be a vehicle for MCE informational forums; they have power at the political level, they are accessible, and they can discuss differences.
- The resources of NEA are available to assist the effort, particularly with regard to upgrading the teaching profession.

Need for clear state-of-the-art summary

- The first priority is to develop a descriptive state-of-the-art summary, written in layman's language, regarding assessment techniques. It should be widely distributed.
- Teachers and parents need to have an up-to-date synthesis of the generally accepted theories of child development re: morality, character, and how their behavior with children is believed to foster or retard this.
- Dissemination in this area as in most areas of education is complicated by the lack of any uniformity in taxonomies, paradigms of instruction, and criteria for correct procedures. We cannot assume a fairly stable set of categories within which the recipient of reports on research or theory or program development will interpret the message. Perhaps the development of some such set of categories, or the means of translating from one set to another, is itself a research project that would make better dissemination possible. For example, the debate over the meaning of citizenship education indicates the point I am making.
- The material that is needed in the field is a state of the art policy: what the theorists know now about current practice -- where certain actions will lead in terms of child development, what programs tend to produce what outcomes and how soon. The key to this suggestion is that the local districts will have their own desired needs, goals, and interactions. Providing them with this data will allow the districts to tailor programs to match felt needs.

- Perhaps one useful technique is to inform or educate certain groups, e.g., foundation people, in a rather special and informal manner about the state of the art. This might be accomplished through special seminars for such persons before coming together in a larger conference. It seems important to bring people to a reasonable level of common understanding of the issues, etc., prior to more complex sharing.
- Clarify the problems and possibilities in lay language.

Need for close relationship between field experience and other MCE elements

- The real problem of dissemination, it seems to me, occurs when the theory and research are conducted at a distance from the settings where they potentially are applied. The closer theory and research are to the applied contexts the less suspicion there is toward them. Dissemination becomes a real problem when there is a complex set of middle terms to be crossed from theory and research to the field. It seems to be a very complex problem that is sometimes uselessly created when the research is done in one context and setting to be applied in another context and setting. The notion of a praxis orientation for good theory development and research is just beginning to be appreciated.
- Following a demonstration project, other schools feeling a need could ally themselves to a technical-assistance program, thus forming a cooperative group which would spread outward to other localities (such a procedural model being based on agricultural demonstration projects).
- The whole concept of dissemination (and implementation) seems inappropriate in the MCE area, since it connotes a procedure of imposition of independently developed ideas and materials from outside onto a local context.

Need for focus on teachers

- In-service teacher training (and funding) is a primary concern.
- Two efforts need to be made to bring more of the teacher-education field under the tent:
 - (a) efforts (mailings, use of the media, etc.) to simply make more teacher educators aware of MCE and the growing efforts in this area -- and to stimulate interest
 - (b) regional institutes -- and other forms of training opportunities (pre-conference workshop days in moral education, for example, piggybacking on existing national education conferences) that train teacher educators in the skills they need to train teachers to be effective moral educators. This will require first identifying people in the field with expertise and experience in working with teachers.
- We should provide teacher-training -- experiential component is essential.
- Disseminate MCE materials from which teachers can choose and integrate those that best fit their individuality, creativity, etc. -- "hamburger-helper" model.
- Provide professional support groups for teachers.

Need for MCE newsletter

- Publish the newsletter!
- Continue, expand on newsletters, material reviews.

Need for visual aids

- Some video tapes, movies, and slide presentations relating to MCE programs would be very helpful.
- Some television programs incorporating video tapes from demonstration projects would help.

Dissemination should be deferred until development is more advanced

- I don't see a concentrated effort or dissemination at this point in time, due to lack of well-defined goals and related methods.
- We haven't anything to disseminate yet. Publication should not be premature.
- Dissemination seems premature.

Highlights

- There is a call for a representative, centralized, coordinating body to lead MCE efforts, with perhaps regional subcenters. Whatever the term used (e.g., "consortium," "center," "confederation"), the desire for a coordinating unit is apparent. Corollary with this is the expressed need for systematic communication across the field.
- A major emphasis of the recommendations is that research, measurement, materials, theory, etc., findings and activities should be summarized (in non-jargon terms), periodically updated, and disseminated to those in the field. The lack of such resources is consistently deplored.
- A second major theme is the call for establishing information networks, dialogues, miniconferences, symposia, workshops, and the like, for exchange and coordination of data concerning a wide range of MCE issues. An important element of this activity should be a mechanism for seeking review of the outcomes from a broadly representative constituency of individuals and organizations. There should be a two-way dissemination flow to and from the "center" and the field.
- A clear state-of-the-art summary is seen as a priority activity.
- A number of specific dissemination techniques are proposed: a newsletter, TV and slide presentation, the use of existing networks (teachers' centers, state departments of education, ERIC), and a MCE clearing house. (There is a minority opinion that such formal dissemination is premature, in light of the current state of the art.

Implementation Issues:
Brainstorming Session

(Selected Comments)

- uncertainty existing in MCE area (polarized attitudes)
- danger of handing teacher too much responsibility in MCE programs
- danger of crisis orientation to MCE (which vitiates MCE intent and efforts)
- issues relating to secular versus religious orientation in MCE
- lack of community-needs assessment related to MCE
- obfuscation of jargon in MCE
- lack of legitimacy for MCE
- danger of MCE overloading the core curriculum
- problems relating to religious opposition to MCE
- parental concerns in MCE: conflict in authority, conflict between reality of home and school, invasion of privacy
- issues relating to local versus federal mandate for MCE
- need for broad (ethnic and class) participation in MCE
- problems relating to indoctrination versus objectivity (neutrality) in MCE
- problems relating to central versus local controls in MCE
- problems relating to process versus product (package) approach in MCE
- issues relating to nature of change agent in MCE
- problems relating to casting school in role of social-change agent
- school administrators' versus teachers' attitudes toward MCE

- need to assess and justify MCE
- need to prioritize expenditures for MCE R and D
- need for community involvement and support in MCE
- danger of empire-building theorists/developers dominating MCE
- issues related to community being viewed as sanctioner of MCE
- lack of faith in MCE rational dialogue
- diversity of MCE teachers' backgrounds, skills, interests
- danger of encroachment of special-interest groups in MCE
- red flag nature of the word "moral"
- complexity of MCE behavior
- absence of professional sanctions in MCE
- need to formulate an acceptable, useful definition of MCE
- problems relating to time requirements for installing MCE (in-service, public relations, etc.)
- lack of professional constituency in MCE
- narrow view of MCE theorists
- varied background of MCE students
- teachers' ignorance of developmental psychology
- threat to teachers'/administrators' sense of power
- educators' fears of community objections to MCE
- parental versus professional desires in MCE

- danger of external imposition of MCE
- teachers' versus community's perception of MCE needs
- need for school to interact with the larger community
- need to provide nonconstraining assistance to MCE teachers
- individualistic versus societal perspective of MCE
- lack of uniform (reliable and valid) MCE measures
- lack of review of recent MCE literature
- issues relating to selection of MCE target group(s) (ethnic and class factors)
- lack of cross-field, multidisciplinary communication in MCE field
- lack of adequate MCE data-base
- issues relating to selection of MCE teachers

Sense of the Conference

As is clear from the preceding summary of recommendations, the Conference generated a healthy mix of convergence and divergence, with the former clearly the dominant tone. For instance, there was virtual unanimity on the following points:

- There is an imperative need to mount MCE programs now.
- There is a need to define MCE, or at least delimit its scope.
- There are pitfalls and caveats which we must be aware of, e.g., "red flag" terminology, the public specter of indoctrination.
- Public policy, theory, research, development, and dissemination must join hands in an interactive, communicative team effort.
- A coalition/confederation providing central coordination is essential.
- The approach must be multidisciplinary.
- Societal sectors (e.g., religious groups, service organizations) must be involved, since they impact significantly on children and their environment.
- Implementation should begin at the school level and involve the community, perhaps subsequently moving to other areas or delivery systems, e.g., parent-training.
- If federal funding is involved, it should be, at most, in partnership with private interests, never dominant.
- The time to act in MCE is now.

These are among some of the points on which there was outstanding consensus. If one could extract, in one phrase, the nub, or sense, of the Conference, it would be: a call for action. Methods, vehicles, processes, management, substance, and format — all these were considered in depth. But the mood was one of energy and readiness to move in the MCE field. How to capitalize on this mood, and how to carry out the Conference recommendations, are the topic of a separate document: the total planning-effort report of recommendations to be submitted to NIE and the public.

In sum, the Conference, together with its products, was the key outcome of the year's planning effort. As such, it set the stage for future MCE endeavors by providing a knowledge-base, communication, impetus, direction, and a vision.

Evaluation of the Conference

While extensive evaluation efforts were not undertaken, the end-of-Conference questionnaire findings were favorable. The evaluation instrument and findings are shown below. It seems clear that the objectives of establishing communication, sharing knowledge, generating recommendations, and promoting commitment to MCE goals were achieved to a large extent.

1. Opportunity to meet with professionally significant individuals:

Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Poor
36	6	0	1	0

2. Opportunity for you to become better informed about development in the MCE domain:

Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Poor
24	15	4	0	0

3. The production of ideas and recommendations concerning MCE:

Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Poor
13	17	10	3	0

4. Overall evaluation of the worth of the Conference:

Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Poor
24	16	2	0	0

5. Did the Conference engage you to the extent that you are willing to invest time in the development and review of MCE R, D, & D if contacted?

Yes
37

Maybe
5

No
0

Conference Publication

A MCE book is in preparation, financed by RBS corporate funds, which is intended for practitioners and students alike. The content will be derived from and build on Conference inputs. A brief prospectus of the book follows:

The four dominant approaches to MCE are each described by a prestigious scholar; the propositions set forth in these descriptions are then critiqued by a group of equally eminent commentators; and finally, the volume's editor, Russell A. Hill, contributes a synthesizing chapter in which (a) the major similarities and differences among the four approaches are illuminated, and (b) a methodology for incorporating the particular benefits of each -- at appropriate places in the curriculum -- is outlined. This final chapter makes several unique contributions. First, it provides a conceptualization -- a conceptual map, as it were -- of the confused and fragmented field of MCE. Second, it draws together and synthesizes knowledge and findings from a broad spectrum of MCE theory, research, practice, and so forth. To our knowledge, this kind of analytic and conceptual overview is nowhere else available. Finally, to enhance the volume's pragmatic appeal for teachers and administrators, each of the sections contains a sequence of practical implications and instructional recommendations.

The major authors include: Jerrold R. Coombs, University of British Columbia; Howard Kirschenbaum, National Humanistic Education Center; Norman A. Sprinthall, University of Minnesota and Ralph L. Mosher, Boston University; and Ervin Staub, University of Massachusetts. Their critiquers include: for Coombs -- Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois; Thomas F. Green, Syracuse University; James E. McClellan, State University of

New York at Albany; for Kirschenbaum — Rodney F. Allen, The Florida State University; John R. Meyer, University of Windsor; Milton Meux, The University of Utah; for Sprinthall and Mosher -- Thomas Lickona, State University of New York College at Cortland; Peter Scharf, University of California at Irvine; Edmund V. Sullivan, Institute of Studies in Education; and for Staub -- James H. Bryan, Northwestern University; Larry C. Jensen, Brigham Young University; Frank D. Payne, San Jose State University.

Negotiations are now underway with commercial publishers which have indicated an interest in publishing such a book.

List of Conference Participants

Allen, Rodney F.

Associate Professor
Department of Social Studies Education
The Florida State University
College of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Andringa, Robert C.

Minority Staff Director
Education and Labor Committee
U.S. House of Representatives
Room 2181-B
2179 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Bagby, Geraldine

Vice-President
The Danforth Foundation
222 S. Central
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Barrett, Monsignor Francis X.

Executive Secretary
Department of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education
National Catholic Educational Association
Suite 350
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Baum, Robert J.

Director
Ethical & Human Value Implication of Science and Technology (EHVIST)
Program
National Science Foundation
Office of Science and Society
Washington, D.C. 20550

Bishop, Milo E.

Assistant Dean
National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology
1 Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, New York 14623

Blum, Mark E.

Research Associate
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Broudy, Harry S.

Consultant to the College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
College of Education
Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Education (CIRCE)
270 Education Building
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Bryam, Claudia

Research Associate
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Bryan, James H.

Professor of Psychology
Northwestern University
Department of Psychology
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Cawelti, Gordon

Executive Director
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
1701 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Champan, Marian L.

Project Manager
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Childs, Stephanie

Assistant Researcher
Local No. 3
1816 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Representing: Philadelphia Federation of Teachers

Cochrane, Don
Professor
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby 2, British Columbia, Canada

Coombs, Jerrold R.
Professor of Philosophy and Education
University of British Columbia
Scarfe Building - Room 2058
Columbia VTLW5 Vancouver, Canada

Eichorn, Dorothy H.
Executive Officer
Institute of Human Development
Tolman Hall
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
Representing: Society for Research in Child Development

Emanuel, Gary
Assistant to the Superintendent of Education for Arizona
1535 W. Jefferson Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Representing: Council of Chief State School Officers, Arizona

Erickson, V. Lois
Assistant Professor
Psychology in the Schools Training Programs
College of Education
N548 Elliott Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Etzioni, Amitai
Director
Center for Policy Research, Inc.
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

Faldet, Marion
Corporate Secretary
The Spencer Foundation
John Hancock Center
875 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Fenton, Edwin

Director of Carnegie-Mellon Education Center
Carnegie-Mellon University
5000 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Fister, J. Blaine

Director
Public Education Concerns
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
475 Riverside Drive
Room 710
New York, New York 10027

Fuchs-Kreimer, Nancy

1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 23306
Representing: Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research

Gaddy, C. Welton

Director of Christian Citizenship Development
The Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Guerriero, Carl

Basic Education Associate
Division of Educational Quality Assessment
Office of Planning and Evaluation
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Helms, David D.

Associate Director of Research and Development
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Heslep, Robert

President
Philosophy of Education Society
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Hill, Russell A.

Director - Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Hogan, Robert

Professor of Psychology
The Johns Hopkins University
Department of Psychology
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Jensen, Larry C.

Professor of Psychology
Brigham Young University
Department of Psychology
1230 SFLC
Provo, Utah 84602

Jones, Erwin N.

Superintendent of Schools
P.O. Box 269
Covina, California 91723
Representing: American Association of School Administration

Kaya, Esin

Director of Doctoral Program in Education Research in the School of
Education
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York 11550

Keller, Edward

National Association of Elementary School Principals
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Kerr, Donna

Assistant Professor in Education
University of Washington, DQ-12
Seattle, Washington 98195

Kimmel, Carol K.

President
National Congress of Parents and Teachers Association
Office of the President
700 North Rush Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Kirschenbaum, Howard
Director
National Humanistic Education Center
110 Spring Street
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

Kniker, Charles
Associate Professor
Iowa State University
Secondary Education
College of Education
218 Curtis Hall
Ames, Iowa 50010

Koehler, Virginia
Acting Chief
National Institute of Education
Teaching Division
Basic Skills Group
Room 815 - Postal Stop 6
Washington, D.C. 20208

Kohlberg, Lawrence
Professor
Harvard University
Roy E. Larson Hall
Appian Way
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Kuhmerker, Lisa
Editor
Moral Education Forum
221 E. 72nd Street
New York, New York 10021

Larkin, James
Director of Teacher Preparation
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Lickona, Thomas
Director of Project Change
Center for Educational Change and Early Childhood Teacher Education
State University of New York at Cortland
Cortland, New York 13045

Lowe, George E.
Staff Director
Office of Education
Health, Education, and Welfare
Room 4027
400 Maryland, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Maguire, Louis M.
Director of Research and Development Division
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Marks, Elaine
Executive Committee
National Education Association
325 Dupre Drive
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29302

McClellan, Dorothy S.
Teacher/Consultant
State University of New York at Albany
Albany, New York 12203

McClellan, James E.
Counselor
State University of New York at Albany
Department of Foundation of Education
Albany, New York 12203

McInnis, Mary
Confidential Assistant to the Commissioner
U.S. Office of Education
Room 4027
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mecklenburger, James A.
Director of Research
National School Board Association
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Mehlinger, Howard
Social Studies Development Center
513 North Park
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Metcalf, Lawrence E.
Professor of Education
Special Field - Social Studies
University of Illinois
Department of Education
388 Education
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Meux, Milton
Associate Professor of Educational Psychology
The University of Utah
Graduate School of Education
Bureau of Educational Research
308 W. Milton Bennion Hall
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Meyer, John R.
Faculty of Education
University of Windsor
600 Third Concession Road
Windsor, Ontario, Canada N9E 1A5

Mosher, Ralph L.
Professor of Education
Chairman of the Department of Counseling Psychology
Co-Director of Danforth Moral Education Project
Boston University
111 Cummington Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Myers, Eddie E.
Head of the Department of Psychology
Educational Research Council of America
Rockefeller Building
614 Superior Avenue, West
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

Ovsiew, Leon

Professor of Educational Administration
Temple University
Ritter Hall Edition
Room 8139
13th and Columbia Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

Pisaro, Samuel

Special Assistant to the Director
National Institute of Education
Program on Teaching
Room 815 - Postal Stop 6
Washington, D.C. 20208

Quie, The Honorable Albert H.

R-Minn.
U.S. House of Representatives
2182 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Rioux, J. William

Senior Associate
National Committee for Citizens in Education
Suite 410
Wildelake Village Green
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Rouk, Ullik

Public Information Officer
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Rubin, Louis

Professor At Large
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Russell, William E.

Program Officer for Elementary and Secondary Education
National Endowment for the Humanities
806 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Ryan, Kevin
Associate Dean
College of Education
Ohio State University
1945 N. High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Sallada, Logan H.
Policy Advisor to the Commissioner
Office of Education
Office of the Commissioner, Washington
Room 4027
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20202

Sanders, Nicholas M.
Project Evaluator
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Scanlon, Robert G.
Executive Director
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Senske, Al H.
Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Schools
Lutheran Church Missouri Synod
Board of Parish Education
3558 S. Jefferson Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63118

Smith, Jane Ann J.
Research Associate
Bureau of Educational Evaluation
2 Rockaway Avenue
Garden City, New York 11530

Snelbecker, Glenn E.
Professor of Educational Psychology
Temple University
Department of Educational Psychology
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Representing: American Psychological Association

Soltis, Jonas F.

Professor of Philosophy and Education
Teachers College
Columbia University
Box 202
New York, New York 10027

Sprinthall, Norman A.

Professor of Educational Psychology
University of Minnesota
Psychology in the Schools Training Program
Department of Psychoeducational Studies
N538 - Elliott Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Staub, Ervin

Professor of Psychology
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Department of Psychology
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Sullivan, Edmund V.

Professor of Applied Psychology
Institute of Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street
Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada

Sullivan, Paul J.

Director of The Ethical Reasoning Project
Tacoma Public Schools
P.O. Box 1357
Tacoma, Washington 98466

Superka, Douglas P.

Values Education Project Coordinator
Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
Educational Resources Center
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Swisher, John D.

Associate Professor of Education
Department of Counselor Education
College of Education
The Pennsylvania State University
1001 University Drive
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Tyler, Ralph W.

Senior Consultant
Office of the President
Science Research Associates, Inc.
259 East Erie Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Vicary, Judith R.

Research Assistant
College of Education
Department of Counselor Education
The Pennsylvania State University
1001 University Drive
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Viehman, Harold H.

Director of Ministries in Public Education
c/o Educational Ministries-ABC
Representing: The American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A.
The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
The United Church of Christ
The United Methodist Church
The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19148

Viehoever, Kent

Research Associate
National Institute of Education
Basic Skills Group
Teaching Division
Room 815 - Postal Stop 6
Washington, D.C. 20208

Walker, Byron H.

Supervisor of Social Studies and Humanities
State Departments Building
Ohio Department of Education
65 S. Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Wallace, Joan D.

Editor and Writer - Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Weber, Robert E.

Associate Education Planner
Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation
New Jersey State Department of Education
225 W. State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Woehr, Wende

Project Secretary - Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Wright, Robert

Media Specialist
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Yetter, Cap C.

Public Information Officer
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

APPENDIX

Informal Commentary on the Conference

Dear Russ,

I want to congratulate you on planning and carrying out one of the most impressive conferences I've ever attended and that part of an equally impressive larger change process. Frankly, I was very skeptical. I had been extremely unimpressed by the conference in Ontario. It struck both Barb and me as one of the greatest wastes of talent we've even seen. And it was downright discouraging to think that this was the leadership of the international moral education movement, with so many people trying to impress each other, put each other down and demonstrate that "my approach is better than yours." The Philadelphia conference just goes to show what I think we all believe — that if you put people in an environment where the rules are favorable to human growth and where the atmosphere is facilitative and supportive, they are going to rise to the occasion. You helped create those norms and the results were astounding. I heard several people, including myself, exclaiming on how much they learned. People listened! They reached out across previously rigid boundaries. I really appreciated having the opportunity to be a part of it and, I hope, to contribute to it. I'm still skeptical about the final outcomes insofar as national funding and legislation goes; but in any case, I think the conference was a huge success. Then again, if any change effort has a chance of having a big impact, yours does. I wish you good luck in all the work ahead in digesting, summarizing, analyzing, and feeding back the enormous amount of data you have to deal with.

Howard Kirschenbaum
National Humanistic Education Center

Dear Russ:

I am still sorting out the many stimulating discussions we had at the Sugar Loaf Conference. I thought your leadership in the conference was most important and that you had a useful structure for the task . . .

I am returning your questionnaire without putting in the amount of thought I had hoped. But we are in several mini-crises this week and I remember your insightful remark that good intentions don't get the material back on time!

As you might have concluded, I was left with some personal disappointment that the whole issue of man's morality seemed to be approached in a wholly intellectual context. Do people really believe that is possible?

Everywhere I look I see men and women -- many with great intellects -- looking for a moral identity, sense of purpose and a reference point for determining answers to life's tough questions. Personally, I believe man was created by God, Who revealed to us moral boundaries outside of which man is unfulfilled, guilt-ridden and aimless. I don't want to get into theology, but it was sad to see so little insight into man's moral nature from the Nation's "experts." There are hundreds of individuals with whom Al Quie and I meet who have a solid hold on the questions that seemed to escape most of the conferees.

Nevertheless, I think your project is worth pursuing and hope that the group will eventually come to a realization that improving a person's reasoning capacity is not the sole answer to moral education. The problem is that, under our system of law, it is not appropriate for the schools to take the leadership in helping young people openly pursue spiritual questions. The dilemma remains: how then to include the schools?

I look forward to keeping in touch with the project. Thanks for including me in the conference.

Robert C. Andringa
Office of Albert H. Quie, MC
House of Representatives

Dear Russ:

Many, many thanks for a super opportunity to exchange views with so many colleagues and interesting persons!!!!!! I didn't get or take the chance to tell you that in our rushed departure. One really serendipitous event was my meeting Byron Walker of the Ohio Department of Education. We had a chance to chat at the airport and I learned of a curriculum package they were completing that is almost identical to our efforts at the early grades. This was a bit of reinforcing from a once unknown source.

You may wish me to repeat my conviction of confidence in the work of RBS in this area. It is the "only" operation in the States that I am confident can and is working on an intelligible approach to moral education. I sometimes get the sense that you may need more said on your behalf and I am prepared to do this for whatever type of audience necessary . . .

John R. Meyer
Values Education Centre

Dear Russ:

First, I think you are to be complimented for the array of talent at many different levels and several different establishments that you brought together. I think a lot of people genuinely appreciated meeting people they had read and wanted to know better. Second, the conference setting was exquisite. It is clearly in what I am coming to understand as the RBS tradition. Third, the vibes from the staff, from you to the youngest Hill, were very warm and supportive . . .

Incidentally, I thought the materials that you prepared for the conference, particularly the booklet, were very helpful . . . Finally, I was very glad to have been invited. I had a chance to have my say about the Feds role (that they commission surveys to see if there is a felt need and the nature of that need and then help small units, states and local communities make their own response to what is found to be the peoples desires and tolerances in this area).

Kevin Ryan
The Ohio State University

Dear Russell,

Congratulations on your successful MCE conference. By creating an opportunity for specialists from widely divergent parts of the continent to get together, you may also have provided the setting from which some other - local and regional - activities may generate . . .

Lisa Kuhmerker
Hunter College

Dear Dr. Hill:

I thought the conference went off very well; it certainly gave me a perspective on the state of the art and the mind in this area that I could not have acquired in any other way so quickly.

With best wishes for the project, I am

Harry S. Broudy
University of Illinois

Dear Russ,

Thanks for a great conference. Your presentation on Sunday morning was not only an excellent summary of the discursion so far, but also a legible signpost of things to come. (Thank goodness you didn't have time to prepare visual aids for that session!)

There are going to be some rough times ahead if MCE is to become something other than a topic for a conference. If we can help, just give us a call.

James E. McClellan
Dorothy McClellan
State University of New York
at Albany

Dear Russ:

My praise for your efforts in organizing the conference. It was the best that I have attended.

Again thanks for the exciting time.

James Bryan
Northwestern University

Russ:

I wanted to drop you a note complimenting you on a brilliant conference!

I have no way of knowing if all of what happened met your expectations and objectives, but it was the finest conference I can recall having attended, with the possible equal of the Oakville, Onatrio (January 1975) meeting (which you also attended). I learned alot. The meetings (especially our discussion group) were fruitful. People were serious and concerned about exploring and understanding rather than winning. In fact, the best point was the level of cooperation. Inspite of the fact that various "camps" in values education were represented, all tried to understand and to concentrate on common points of agreement -- rather than bicker and snipe.

Congratulations!

Rodney F. Allen
Florida State University

Dear Russ:

Many thanks for inviting me to your conference. I thought it was very well run, that the competency level of the group was surprisingly high, and I enjoyed meeting a number of the people. I hope that the conference yielded the results that you particularly desired.

Robert Hogan
The Johns Hopkins University

Dear Russ,

I thoroughly enjoyed the conference -- met lots of good people, got lots of good ideas, and came away sharing your optimism about the future of the field. I think there's a great contribution waiting to be made -- if we have the will to make it.

Thomas Lickona
State University of New York at
Cortland

Dear Mr. Hill:

I very much enjoyed the conference. Had it have been possible, I would have taken the opportunity to stay for the whole weekend.

Albert H. Quie, MC
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Hill,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in a most informative and well planned weekend. I learned a great deal and hope that I will be able to communicate my interest to the Synagogue Council. We will certainly have to stay in touch.

Nancy Fuchs-Kreimer
Representing: Institute for
Jewish Policy Planning and
Research
Synagogue Council of America

Dear Russ,

I learned a good deal from [the Conference] and was glad to have an opportunity to participate . . .

Ralph W. Tyler
Senior Consultant
Science Research Associates

RBS POSITION AND RESEARCH PAPERS ON MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

- Bell, T.H. *Morality and citizenship education: Whose responsibility?* Occasional Paper No. 1, 1976.
- Fenton, E. *The relationship of citizenship education to values education.* Occasional Paper No. 2, 1976.
- Hill, R.A. *Ethical/Moral Action Instructional Program.* Position Paper No. 1, 1975.
- Hill, R.A., Newcombe, E., Young, J., & Wallace, J. *Research studies reporting experimental effects in the moral/ethical/values domain: An annotated bibliography.* 1977.
- Hill, R.A., & Wallace, J. *Report on the National Conference on Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education.* 1976.
- Hill, R.A., & Wallace, J. *Recommendations for a R, D, and D agenda in ethical citizenship education.* 1976.
- Klafter, M., & Wallace, J. *A bibliography on moral/values education.* 1976.
- Senders, N.M. *Plans for the field test of the Ethical/Moral Action Instructional Program.* Position Paper No. 2, 1975.
- Senders, N.M., & Klafter, M. *The importance and desired characteristics of moral/ethical education in the public schools: A systematic analysis of recent documents.* 1975.
- Senders, N.M., & Wallace, J. *Teacher and parent opinion concerning moral/ethical education in the public schools: A report of an Institute for Survey Research study.* 1975.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

PLANNING FOR MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION is based on three assumptions: the need for and interest in moral/citizenship education are increasingly expressed in many segments of our society; the field is rich with diverse activities, theories, research, and promising directions to explore; a national coordinating effort is necessary to draw together this diversity and establish common ground and guidelines for future work across the field. To this end, the initial objectives of the planning program include: coordinating activities, sharing knowledge, identifying issues, convening informational planning conferences, examining managerial techniques, analyzing programmatic approaches, and preparing planning recommendations. An Advisory Group and Resource Panel will assist in shaping the planning program.

ADVISORY GROUP

Monsignor Francis X. Barrett
Executive Secretary
Department of Chief Administrators of
Catholic Education
National Catholic Education Association

Ms. Vivian Bowser
Executive Committee
National Education Association

Gordon Cawelti
Executive Director
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

J. Blaine Fister
Director
Public Education Concerns
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Ms. Carol Kimmel
President
National Congress of Parents and Teachers

Karl Massaneri
Associate Director
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

William J. Russell
Executive Officer
American Educational Research Association

Ira Silverman
Director
Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research
Synagogue Council of America

Ms. Carolyn Warner
Chief State School Officer, Arizona
Council of Chief State School Officers

Herold H. Viehman
Director
Ministry in Public Education

RESOURCE PANEL

Harry S. Broudy
University of Illinois

Jerrold Coombs
University of British Columbia

Howard Kirschenbaum
National Humanistic Education Center

Lawrence Kohlberg
Harvard University

Louis Rubin
University of Illinois

Norman Sprinthall
University of Minnesota

Ervin Staub
University of Massachusetts

Ralph Tyler
Science Research Associates